Recoverability of Group Sparse Signals from Corrupted Measurements via Robust Group Lasso

Xiaohan Wei, Qing Ling, and Zhu Han

arXiv:1509.08490v1 [cs.IT] 28 Sep 2015

Abstract

This paper considers the problem of recovering a group sparse signal matrix $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{y}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{y}_L]$ from sparsely corrupted measurements $\mathbf{M} = [\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{y}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{y}_L] + \mathbf{S}$, where $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$'s are known sensing matrices and $\mathbf{S}$ is an unknown sparse error matrix. A robust group lasso (RGL) model is proposed to recover $\mathbf{Y}$ and $\mathbf{S}$ through simultaneously minimizing the $\ell_{2,1}$-norm of $\mathbf{Y}$ and the ℓ_1-norm of $\mathbf{S}$ under the measurement constraints. We prove that $\mathbf{Y}$ and $\mathbf{S}$ can be exactly recovered from the RGL model with a high probability for a very general class of $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$'s.

I. Introduction

Consider the problem of recovering a group sparse signal matrix $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{y}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{y}_L] \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ from sparsely corrupted measurements

$$\mathbf{M} = [\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{y}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{y}_L] + \mathbf{S}, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{M} = [\mathbf{m}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{m}_L] \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$ is a measurement matrix, $\mathbf{A}_{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times n}$ is the i-th sensing matrix, and $\mathbf{S} = [\mathbf{s}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{s}_L] \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$ is an unknown sparse error matrix. The error matrix $\mathbf{S}$ is sparse as it has only a small number of nonzero entries. The signal matrix $\mathbf{Y}$ is group sparse, meaning that $\mathbf{Y}$ is sparse and its nonzero entries appear in a small number of common rows.

Given $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$'s, our goal is to recover $\mathbf{Y}$ and $\mathbf{S}$ from the linear measurement equation (1). In this paper, we propose to accomplish the recovery task through solving the following robust group lasso

Xiaohan Wei is with Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Southern California. Email: xiaohanw@usc.edu. Qing Ling is With Department of Automation, University of Science and Technology of China. Email: qingling@mail.ustc.edu.cn. Zhu Han is with Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Houston. Email: zhan2@uh.edu.

(RGL) model

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{S}} \quad & \|\mathbf{Y}\|_{2,1} + \lambda\|\mathbf{S}\|_1, \\ s.t. \quad & \mathbf{M} = [\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{y}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{y}_L] + \mathbf{S}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Denoting y_{ij} and s_{ij} as the (i,j)-th entries of $\mathbf{Y}$ and $\mathbf{S}$, respectively, $\|\mathbf{Y}\|_{2,1} \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{L} y_{ij}^2}$ is defined as the $\ell_{2,1}$-norm of $\mathbf{Y}$ and $\|\mathbf{S}\|_1 \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{L} |s_{ij}|$ is defined as the ℓ_1-norm of $\mathbf{S}$. Minimizing the $\ell_{2,1}$-norm term promotes group sparsity of $\mathbf{Y}$ while minimizing the ℓ_1-norm term promotes sparsity of $\mathbf{S}$; λ is a nonnegative parameter to balance the two terms. We prove that solving the RGL model in (2), which is a convex program, enables exact recovery of $\mathbf{Y}$ and $\mathbf{S}$ with high probability, given that $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$'s satisfy certain conditions.

A. From Group Lasso to Robust Group Lasso

Sparse signal recovery has attracted research interests in the signal processing and optimization communities during the past few years. Various sparsity models have been proposed to better exploit the sparse structures of high-dimensional data, such as sparsity of a vector [1], [2], group sparsity of vectors [3], and low-rankness of a matrix [4]. For more topics related to sparse signal recovery, readers are referred to the recent survey paper [5].

In this paper we are interested in the recovery of group sparse (also known as block sparse [6] or jointly sparse [7]) signals which finds a variety of applications such as direction-of-arrival estimation [8], [9], collaborative spectrum sensing [10], [11], [12] and motion detection [13]. A signal matrix $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{y}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{y}_L] \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ is called k-group sparse if k rows of $\mathbf{Y}$ are nonzero. A measurement matrix $\mathbf{M} = [\mathbf{m}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{m}_L] \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$ is taken from linear projections $\mathbf{m}_i = \mathbf{A}_{(i)}\mathbf{y}_i$, $i = 1, \cdots, L$, where $\mathbf{A}_{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times n}$ is a sensing matrix. In order to recover $\mathbf{Y}$ from $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$'s and $\mathbf{M}$, the standard $\ell_{2,1}$-norm minimization formulation proposes to solve a convex program

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{Y}} \quad & \|\mathbf{Y}\|_{2,1}, \\ s.t. \quad & \mathbf{M} = [\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{y}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{y}_L]. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

This is a straightforward extension from the canonical ℓ_1-norm minimization formulation that recovers a sparse vector. Theoretical guarantee of exact recovery has been developed based on the restricted isometric property (RIP) of $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$'s [14], and a reduction of the required number of measurements can also be achieved through simultaneously minimizing the $\ell_{2,1}$-norm and the nuclear norm of $\mathbf{Y}$; see [15] and [16].

Consider that in practice the measurements are often corrupted by random noise, resulting in $\mathbf{M} = [\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{y}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{y}_L] + \mathbf{N}$ where $\mathbf{N} = [\mathbf{n}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{n}_L] \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$ is a noise matrix. To address the noise-corrupted case, the group lasso model in [3] solves

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{Y},\mathbf{E}} \quad & \|\mathbf{Y}\|_{2,1} + \gamma\|\mathbf{N}\|_F^2, \\ s.t. \quad & \mathbf{M} = [\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{y}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{y}_L] + \mathbf{N}, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where γ is a nonnegative parameter and $\|\mathbf{N}\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm of $\mathbf{N}$. An alternative to (4) is

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{Y}} \quad & \|\mathbf{Y}\|_{2,1}, \\ s.t. \quad & \|\mathbf{M} - [\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{y}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{y}_L]\|_F^2 \leq \varepsilon^2, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where ε controls the noise level. It has been shown in [14] that if the sensing matrices $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$'s satisfy RIP, then the distance between the solution to (5) and the true signal matrix, which is measured by the Frobenius norm, is within a constant multiple of ε.

The exact recovery guarantee for (5) is elegant, but works only if the noise level ε is sufficiently small. However, in many practical applications, some of the measurements may be seriously contaminated or even missing due to uncertainties such as sensor failures and transmission errors. Meanwhile, this kind of measurement errors are often sparse (see [17] for detailed discussions). In this case, the exact recovery guarantee does not hold and the solution of (5) can be far away from the true signal matrix.

The need of handling large but sparse measurement errors in the group sparse signal recovery problem motivates the RGL model (2), which has found successful applications in, for example, the cognitive network sensing problem [17]. In (2), the measurement matrix $\mathbf{M}$ is contaminated by a sparse error matrix $\mathbf{S} = [\mathbf{s}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{s}_L] \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$ whose nonzero entries might be unbounded. Through simultaneously minimizing the $\ell_{2,1}$-norm of $\mathbf{Y}$ and the ℓ_1 norm of $\mathbf{S}$, we expect to recover the group sparse signal matrix $\mathbf{Y}$ and the sparse error matrix $\mathbf{S}$.

The RGL model (2) is tightly related to robust lasso and robust principle component analysis (RPCA), both of which have been proved effectively in recovering true signal from sparse gross corruptions. The robust lasso model, which has been discussed extensively in [18], [19], [20], minimizes the ℓ_1-norm of a sparse signal vector and the ℓ_1-norm of a sparse error vector simultaneously in order to remove sparse corruptions. Whereas the RPCA model, which is first proposed in [21] and then extended by [22] and [23], recovers a low rank matrix by minimizing the nuclear norm of signal matrix plus the ℓ_1-norm of sparse error matrix.

B. Contribution and Paper Organization

This paper proposes the RGL model for recovering the group sparse signal from unbounded sparse corruptions and proves that with a high probability, the proposed RGL model (2) exactly recovers the group sparse signal matrix and the sparse error matrix simultaneously under certain restrictions on the measurement matrix for a very general class of sample matrices.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II provides the main result (see Theorem 1) on the recoverability of the RGL model (2) under the assumptions on the sensing matrices and the true signal and error matrices (see Assumptions 1-4). Section II also introduces several supporting lemmas and corollaries (See Lemmas 1-4 and Corollaries 1-2). Section III gives the dual certificates of (2), one is exact (see Theorem 2) and the other is inexact (see Theorem 3), which are sufficient conditions guaranteing exact recovery from the RGL model with a high probability. Their proofs are based on two supporting lemmas (see Lemmas 5- 6). Section IV proves that the inexact dual certificate of (2) can be satisfied through a constructive manner (see Theorem 4 and Lemma 7). This way, we prove the main result given in Section II. Section V concludes the paper.

C. Notations

We introduce several notations that are used in the subsequent sections. Bold uppercase letters denote matrices, whereas bold lowercase letters with subscripts and superscripts stand for column vectors and row vectors, respectively. For a matrix $\mathbf{U}$, we denote $\mathbf{u}_i$ as its i-th column, $\mathbf{u}^i$ as its j-th row, and u_{ij} as its (i,j)-th element. For a given vector $\mathbf{u}$, we denote u_i as its i-th element. The notations $\{\mathbf{U}_{(i)}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{u}_{(i)}\}$ denote the family of matrices and vectors indexed by i, respectively. The notations $\{\mathbf{U}_{(i,j)}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{u}_{(i,j)}\}$ denote the family of matrices and vectors indexed by (i,j), respectively. vec$(\cdot)$ is the vectorizing operator that stacks the columns of a matrix one after another. $\{\cdot\}'$ denotes the transpose operator. $\mathbf{diag}\{\cdot\}$ represents a diagonal matrix and $\mathbf{BLKdiag}\{\cdot\}$ represents a block diagonal matrix. The notation $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes the inner product, when applying to two matrices $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$. sgn$(\mathbf{u})$ and sgn$(\mathbf{U})$ are sign vector and sign matrix for $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{U}$, respectively.

Additionally, we use several standard matrix and vector norms. For a vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{R}^n$, define

- ℓ_2-norm: $\|\mathbf{u}\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n u_j^2}$.
- ℓ_1-norm: $\|\mathbf{u}\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^n |u_j|$.

For a matrix $\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times n}$, define

- $\ell_{2,1}$-norm: $\|\mathbf{U}\|_{2,1} = \sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n u_{ij}^2}$.

- $\ell_{2,\infty}$-norm: $\|\mathbf{U}\|_{2,\infty} = \max_i \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{n} u_{ij}^2}$.
- ℓ_1-norm: $\|\mathbf{U}\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n} |u_{ij}|$.
- Frobenius norm: $\|\mathbf{U}\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n} u_{ij}^2}$.
- ℓ_∞-norm: $\|\mathbf{U}\|_\infty = \max_{i,j} |u_{ij}|$.

Also, we use the notation $\|\mathbf{U}\|_{(p,q)}$ to denote the induced norms, which stands for

$$\|\mathbf{U}\|_{(p,q)} = \max_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{R}^n} \frac{\|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{x}\|_p}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_q}.$$

For the signal matrix $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ and noise matrix $\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$, we use the following set notations throughout the paper.

- T: The row group support (namely, the set of row coordinates corresponding to the nonzero rows of the signal matrix) whose cardinality is denoted as $k_T = |T|$.
- T^c: The complement of T (namely, $\{1,\cdots,n\} \setminus T$).
- Ω: The support of error matrix (namely, the set of coordinates corresponding to the nonzero elements of the error matrix) whose cardinality is denoted as $k_\Omega = |\Omega|$.
- Ω^c: The complement of Ω (namely, $\{1,\cdots,n\} \times \{1,\cdots,L\} \setminus \Omega$).
- Ω_i: The support of the i-th column the error matrix whose cardinality is denoted as $k_{\Omega_i} = |\Omega_i|$.
- Ω_i^c: The complement of Ω_i (namely, $\{1,\cdots,n\} \setminus \Omega_i$).
- Ω_i^*: An arbitrary fixed subset of Ω_i^c with cardinality $m - k_{\max}$, where $k_{\max} = \max_i k_{\Omega_i}$. Intuitively, Ω_i^* stands for the *maximal non-corrupted set* across different $i \in \{1,\cdots,L\}$.

For any given matrices $\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$, $\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ and given vectors $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{R}^m$, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{R}^n$, define the orthogonal projection operators as follows.

- $\mathcal{P}_\Omega\mathbf{U}$: The orthogonal projection of matrix $\mathbf{U}$ onto Ω (namely, set every entry of $\mathbf{U}$ whose coordinate belongs to Ω^c as 0 while keep other entries unchanged).
- $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\mathbf{u}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^c}\mathbf{u}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{u}$: The orthogonal projections of $\mathbf{u}$ onto Ω_i, Ω_i^c, and Ω_i^*, respectively.
- $\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{v}$: The orthogonal projection of $\mathbf{v}$ onto T.
- $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\mathbf{U}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^c}\mathbf{U}$, and $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{U}$: The orthogonal projections of each column of $\mathbf{U}$ onto Ω_i, Ω_i^c, and Ω_i^*, respectively (namely, $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\mathbf{U} = [\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\mathbf{u}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\mathbf{u}_L]$, $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^c}\mathbf{U} = [\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^c}\mathbf{u}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^c}\mathbf{u}_L]$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{U} = [\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{u}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{u}_L]$).
- $\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{V}$: The orthogonal projection of each column of $\mathbf{V}$ onto T.

Furthermore, we admit a notational convention that for any projection operator $\mathcal{P}$ and corresponding matrix $\mathbf{U}$ (or vector $\mathbf{u}$), it holds

$$\mathbf{U}'\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}\mathbf{U})' \,(\text{or } \mathbf{u}'\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}\mathbf{u})').$$

Finally, by saying an event occurs with a high probability, we mean that the occurring probability of the event is at least $1 - Cn^{-1}$ where C is a constant.

II. Main Result of Exact Recovery

This section provides the theoretical performance guarantee of the RGL model (2). Section II-A makes several assumptions under which (2) recovers the true group sparse signal and sparse error matrices with a high probability. The main result is summarized in Theorem 1. Section II-B interprets the meanings of Theorem 1 and explains its relations to previous works. Section II-A gives several measure concentration inequalities that are useful in the proof of the main result.

A. Assumptions and Main Result

We start from several assumptions on the sensing matrices, as well as the true group sparse signal and sparse error matrices. Consider L distributions $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^L$ in $\mathcal{R}^n$ and an independently sampled vector $\mathbf{a}_{(i)}$ from each $\mathcal{F}_i$. The correlation matrix is defined as

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)} = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{a}_{(i)}\mathbf{a}_{(i)}'\right],$$

and the corresponding condition number is

$$\kappa_i = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{\max}\{\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}\}}{\lambda_{\min}\{\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}\}}},$$

where $\lambda_{\max}\{\cdot\}$ and $\lambda_{\min}\{\cdot\}$ denotes the largest and smallest eigenvalues of a matrix, respectively. We use $\kappa_{\max} = \max_i \kappa_i$ to represent the maximum condition number regarding a set of covariance matrices. Observe that this condition number is finite if and only if the covariance matrix is invertible, and is larger than or equal to 1 in any case.

Assumption 1: For $i = 1, \cdots, L$, define the i-th sensing matrix as

$$\mathbf{A}_{(i)} \triangleq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_{(i)1}' \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{a}_{(i)m}' \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times n}.$$

Therein, $\{\mathbf{a}_{(i)1}, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_{(i)m}\}$ is assumed to be a sequence of i.i.d. random vectors drawn from the distribution $\mathcal{F}_i$ in $\mathcal{R}^n$.

By Assumption 1, we suppose that every sensing matrix $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$ is randomly sampled from a corresponding distribution $\mathcal{F}_i$. We proceed to assume the properties of the distributions $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^L$.

Assumption 2: For each $i = 1, \cdots, L$, the distribution $\mathcal{F}_i$ satisfies the following two properties.

- **Completeness**: The correlation matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}$ is invertible.
- **Incoherence:** Each sensing vector $\mathbf{a}_{(i)}$ sampled from $\mathcal{F}_i$ satisfies

$$\max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,n\}} |\langle \mathbf{a}_{(i)}, \mathbf{e}_k\rangle| \leq \sqrt{\mu_i}, \tag{6}$$

$$\max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,n\}} |\langle \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)}, \mathbf{e}_k\rangle| \leq \sqrt{\mu_i}, \tag{7}$$

for some fixed constant $\mu_i \geq 1$, where $\{\mathbf{e}_k\}_{k=1}^n$ is the standard basis in $\mathcal{R}^n$.

We call μ_i as the incoherence parameter and use $\mu_{\max} = \max_i \mu_i$ to denote the maximum incoherence parameter among a set of L distributions $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^L$. Note that this incoherence condition is stronger than the one originally presented in [25], which does not require (7). If one wants to get rid of (7), then some other restrictions must be imposed on the sensing matrices (see [26] for related results).

Observe that the bounds (6) and (7) in Assumption 2 are meaningless unless we fix the scale of $\mathbf{a}_{(i)}$. Thus, we have the following assumption.

Assumption 3: The correlation matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}$ satisfies

$$\lambda_{\max}\{\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}\} = \lambda_{\min}\{\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}\}^{-1}, \tag{8}$$

for any $\mathcal{F}_i,\ i = 1, \cdots, L$.

Given any complete $\mathcal{F}_i$, (8) can always be achieved by scaling $\mathbf{a}_{(i)}$ up or down. This is true because if we scale $\mathbf{a}_{(i)}$ up, then $\lambda_{\max}\{\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}\}$ increases and $\lambda_{\min}\{\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}\}^{-1}$ decreases. Observe that the optimization problem (2) is invariant under scaling. Thus, Assumption 3 does not pose any extra constraint.

Additionally, we denote $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ as the true group sparse signal and sparse error matrices to recover, respectively. The assumption on $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ is given as below.

Assumption 4: The true signal matrix $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$ and error matrix $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ satisfy the following two properties.

- The row group support of $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$ and the support of $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ are fixed and denoted as T and Ω, respectively.
- The signs of the elements of $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ are i.i.d. and equally likely to be $+1$ or -1.

Under the assumptions stated above, we have the following main theorem on the recoverability of the RGL model (2).

Theorem 1: Under Assumptions 1-4, the solution pair $(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}, \hat{\mathbf{S}})$ to the optimization problem (2) is exact and unique with probability at least $1 - (16 + 2e^{\frac{1}{4}})n^{-1}$, provided that $\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log n}}$, $k_T L \leq n$,

$$k_T \leq \alpha \frac{m}{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log^2 n}, \quad k_\Omega \leq \beta\frac{m}{\mu_{\max}}, \quad k_{\max} \leq \gamma\frac{m}{\kappa_{\max}}. \tag{9}$$

Here $\mu_{\max} \triangleq \max_i \mu_i$, $\kappa_{\max} \triangleq \max_i \kappa_i$, $k_{\max} \triangleq \max_i k_{\Omega_i}$, and $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{9600}$, $\beta \leq \frac{1}{3136}$, $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{4}$ are all positive constants[1].

B. Interpretations of Theorem 1 and Relations to Previous Works

Now we discuss what Theorem 1 implies. First, it infers that when the signal matrix $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$ is sufficiently group sparse and the error matrix $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ sufficiently sparse (see the bounds on k_T, k_Ω, and $k_{\max}$), then with high probability we are able to exactly recover them. Second, observe that the group sparsity does not depend on L, the number of columns of the signal matrix, as long as L is not too large (see the bound on k_T). This demonstrates the ability of the RGL model in recovering group sparse signals even though each nonzero row is not sparse. Last, to keep the proof simple, we do not optimize the constants α, β, and γ. However, it is possible to increase the values of the constants and consequently relax the requirements on the sparsity patterns.

Theorem 1 is a result of RIPless analysis, which shares the same limitation as all other RIPless analyses. To be specific, Theorem 1 only holds for arbitrary but *fixed* $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ (except that the elements of $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ have uniform random signs by Assumption 4). If we expect to have a uniform recovery guarantee here (namely, considering random sensing matrices as well as signal and error matrices with random supports), then certain stronger assumptions must be made on the sensing matrices such as the RIP condition [15].

The proof of Theorem 1 is based on the construction of an inexact dual certificate through the golfing scheme. The golfing scheme was first introduced in [24] for low rank matrix recovery. Subsequently, [25] and [26] refined and used the scheme to prove the lasso recovery guarantee. The work [19] generalized it to mix-norm recovery. In this paper, we consider a new mix-norm problem, namely, summation of the $\ell_{2,1}$-norm and the ℓ_1-norm.

C. Measure Concentration Inequalities

Below we give several measure concentration inequalities that are useful in the proofs of the paper. We begin with two lemmas on Berstein inequalities from [25], whose proofs are omitted for brevity. The first one is a matrix Berstein inequality.

Lemma 1: (Matrix Berstein Inequality) Consider a finite sequence of independent random matrices $\{\mathbf{M}_{(j)} \in \mathcal{R}^{d\times d}\}$. Assume that every random matrix satisfies $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{M}_{(j)}\right] = 0$ and $\|\mathbf{M}_{(j)}\|_{(2,2)} \leq B$ almost

[1]The bounds on α, β, γ are chosen such that all the requirements on these constants in the subsequent lemmas and theorems are met.

surely. Define

$$\sigma^2 \triangleq \max\left\{\left\|\sum_j \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{M}'_{(j)}\mathbf{M}_{(j)}\right]\right\|_{(2,2)}, \left\|\sum_j \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{M}_{(j)}\mathbf{M}'_{(j)}\right]\right\|_{(2,2)}\right\}.$$

Then, for all $t \geq 0$, we have

$$Pr\left\{\left\|\sum_j \mathbf{M}_{(j)}\right\|_{(2,2)} \geq t\right\} \leq 2d\exp\left(-\frac{t^2/2}{\sigma^2 + Bt/3}\right).$$

We also need a vector form of the Berstein inequality.

Lemma 2: (Vector Berstein Inequality) Consider a finite sequence of independent random vectors $\{\mathbf{g}_{(j)} \in \mathcal{R}^d\}$. Assume that every random vector satisfies $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}_{(j)}\right] = 0$ and $\|\mathbf{g}_{(j)}\|_2 \leq B$ almost surely. Define $\sigma^2 \triangleq \sum_k \mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{g}_{(j)}\|_2^2\right]$. Then, for all $0 \leq t \leq \sigma^2/B$, we have

$$Pr\left(\left\|\sum_j \mathbf{g}_{(j)}\right\|_2 \geq t\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{8\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{4}\right).$$

Next, we use the matrix Berstein inequality to prove its extension on a block anisotropic matrix.

Lemma 3: Consider a matrix $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$ satisfying the model described in Section II-A, and denote $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$. For any $\tau > 0$, it holds

$$Pr\left\{\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\|_{(2,2)} \geq \tau\right\} \leq 2k_T\exp\left(-\frac{m-k_{\max}}{\kappa_i k_T \mu_i}\frac{\tau^2}{4(1+\frac{2\tau}{3})}\right),$$

and

$$Pr\left\{\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1} - \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\|_{(2,2)} \geq \tau\right\} \leq 2k_T\exp\left(-\frac{m-k_{\max}}{\kappa_i k_T \mu_i}\frac{\tau^2}{4(\kappa_i+\frac{2\tau}{3})}\right).$$

We show the proof of the second part in Appendix A. The first part can be proved in a similar way. Two consequent corollaries of Lemma 3 show that the restriction of $\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}, \cdots, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}\right\}$ to the corresponding support T is near isometric.

Corollary 1: Denote $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$. Given $k_T \leq \alpha\frac{m}{L\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log n}$, $k_{\max} \leq \gamma m$, and $\frac{1-\gamma}{\alpha} \geq 64$, then with probability at least $1-2n^{-2}$, we have

$$\left\|\mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T, \ \cdots, \ \mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\}\right\|_{(2,2)} < \frac{1}{2}. \quad (10)$$

Furthermore, given $k_T \leq \alpha\frac{m}{L\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log^2 n}$, $k_{\max} \leq \gamma m$, and $\frac{1-\gamma}{\alpha} \geq 64$, with at least the same probability, we have

$$\left\|\mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T, \ \cdots, \ \mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\}\right\|_{(2,2)} < \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log n}}. \quad (11)$$

Proof: First, following directly from the first part of Lemma 3, for all $i = 1, \cdots, L$, it holds

$$Pr\left\{\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}-\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\|_{(2,2)}\geq\tau\right\}\leq 2k_T\exp\left\{-\frac{m-k_{\max}}{k_T\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}}\frac{\tau^2}{4(1+\frac{2\tau}{3})}\right\}. \tag{12}$$

Taking a union bound over all $i = 1, \cdots, L$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&Pr\left\{\left\|\mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}-\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T,\ \cdots,\ \mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}-\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\}\right\|_{(2,2)}\geq\tau\right\}\\
&=Pr\left\{\max_i\left\{\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}-\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\|_{(2,2)}\right\}\geq\tau\right\}\\
&\leq\sum_{i=1}^{L}Pr\left\{\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}-\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\|_{(2,2)}\geq\tau\right\}\\
&\leq 2k_TL\exp\left\{-\frac{m-k_{\max}}{k_T\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}}\frac{\tau^2}{4(1+\frac{2\tau}{3})}\right\}.
\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

Plugging in $\tau=\frac{1}{2}$ and using the fact that $k_T\leq\alpha\frac{m}{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log n}$ and $k_{\max}\leq\gamma m$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{The last line of }(13)&=2k_TL\exp\left\{-\frac{3(1-\gamma)}{64\alpha}\log n\right\}\\
&=2k_TLn^{-\frac{3(1-\gamma)}{64\alpha}}\\
&\leq 2k_TLn^{-3}\leq 2n^{-2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from $\frac{1-\gamma}{\alpha}\geq 64$ and the second inequality follows from $k_TL\leq n$. Similarly, plugging in $\tau=\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log n}}$ and using the fact that $k_T\leq\alpha\frac{m}{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log^2 n}$, we prove (11) as long as $\frac{1-\gamma}{\alpha}\geq 64$. ■

Corollary 2: Given that $k_T\leq\alpha\frac{m}{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log n}$, $k_{\max}\leq\gamma m$, and $\frac{1-\gamma}{\alpha}\geq 64$, then with probability at least $1-2n^{-2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1}-\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1}\right)\mathcal{P}_T,\right.\right.\\
&\left.\left.\cdots,\ \mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1}-\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\}\right\|_{(2,2)}<\frac{\kappa_{\max}}{2}.
\end{aligned}\tag{14}$$

The proof is almost the same as proving (10) using Lemma 3. We omit the details for brevity.

Finally, we have the following lemma show that if the support of the columns in $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$ is restricted to Ω_i^*, then no column indexed inside T can be well approximated by the column indexed outside of T. In other words, those columns correspond to the true signal matrix shall be well distinguished.

Lemma 4: (Off-support incoherence) Denote $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}=\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$. Given $k_T\leq\alpha\frac{m}{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log n}$ and $\alpha<\frac{1}{24}$, with probability at least $1-e^{\frac{1}{4}}n^{-2}$, we have

$$\max_{i\in\{1,\cdots,L\},k\in T^c}\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}\mathbf{e}_k\right\|_2\leq 1, \tag{15}$$

where $\{\mathbf{e}_k\}_{k=1}^n$ is a standard basis in $\mathcal{R}^n$.

The proof of Lemma 4 is given in Appendix B.

With particular note, in the above lemmas and corollaries, all the requirements on the constants α, β and γ satisfy the bounds in Theorem 1.

III. Exact and Inexact Dual Certificates

This section gives the dual certificates of the RGL model, namely, the sufficient conditions under which the optimal solution pair of (2) is unique and equal to the pair of the true signal and error matrices. Sections III-A and III-B prove the exact and inexact dual certificates, respectively. The inexact dual certificate is a perturbation of the exact one, enabling easier construction of the certificate in Section IV.

A. Exact Dual Certificate

Below we show that the optimal solution pair $(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}, \hat{\mathbf{S}})$ of the RGL model (2) is equal to the true signal and noise pair $(\overline{\mathbf{Y}}, \overline{\mathbf{S}})$ when certain certificate conditions hold. First we have two preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 5: Suppose that $\overline{\mathbf{Y}} \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{S}} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$ are the true group sparse signal and sparse error matrices, respectively. If $(\overline{\mathbf{Y}} + \mathbf{H}, \overline{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{F})$ is an optimal solution pair to (2), where $\mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ and $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$, then the following results hold:

i) $\left[\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L\right] = \mathbf{F}$;

ii) $\|\overline{\mathbf{Y}} + \mathbf{H}\|_{2,1} + \lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{F}\|_1 \geq \|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{2,1} + \lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}\|_1 + \|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1} + \lambda\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1 + \langle\overline{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \lambda\langle\text{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \mathbf{F}\rangle$.

where $\overline{\mathbf{V}} \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{P}_T\overline{\mathbf{V}})^i = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{y}}^i}{\|\bar{\mathbf{y}}^i\|_2}$ and $(\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\overline{\mathbf{V}})^i = \mathbf{0}$, $\forall i = 1, \cdots, n$. Here $(\mathcal{P}_T\overline{\mathbf{V}})^i$ denotes the i-th row of $\mathcal{P}_T\overline{\mathbf{V}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{y}}^i$ denotes the i-th row of $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$.

The proof of Lemma 5 is given in Appendix C.

Lemma 6: For any two matrices $\mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ and $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$, with probability at least $1 - 2n^{-2}$, $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{0}$ if the following conditions are satisfied:

i) $k_T \leq \alpha\frac{m}{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log^2 n}$, $k_{\max} \leq \gamma m$, and $\frac{1-\gamma}{\alpha} \geq 64$;

ii) $\left[\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L\right] = \mathbf{F}$;

iii) $\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{0}$.

The proof of Lemma 6 is given in Appendix D.

Theorem 2: (*Exact Duality*) Suppose $\overline{\mathbf{Y}} \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{S}} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$ are the true group sparse signal and sparse error matrices satisfying the assumptions in Theorem 1. The pair $(\overline{\mathbf{Y}}, \overline{\mathbf{S}})$ is the unique solution to

the RGL model (2) with a high probability if there exists a dual certificate $\mathbf{W} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$ such that

$$\mathcal{P}_T\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathbf{w}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathbf{w}_L\right] = \overline{\mathbf{V}}, \tag{16}$$

$$\left\|\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathbf{w}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathbf{w}_L\right]\right\|_{2,\infty} < 1, \tag{17}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_\Omega \mathbf{W} = \lambda \text{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \tag{18}$$

$$\|\mathbf{W}\|_\infty < \lambda, \tag{19}$$

where $\overline{\mathbf{V}} \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{P}_T\overline{\mathbf{V}})^i = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{y}}^i}{\|\bar{\mathbf{y}}^i\|_2}$ and $(\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\overline{\mathbf{V}})^i = \mathbf{0}$, $\forall i = 1, \cdots, n$. Here $(\mathcal{P}_T\overline{\mathbf{V}})^i$ denotes the i-th row of $\mathcal{P}_T\overline{\mathbf{V}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{y}}^i$ denotes the i-th row of $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$.

Proof: Suppose that $(\overline{\mathbf{Y}} + \mathbf{H}, \overline{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{F})$, where $\mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ and $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$, is an optimal solution pair to (2). Therefore, the two results in Lemma 5 hold true. Proving that the pair $(\overline{\mathbf{Y}}, \overline{\mathbf{S}})$ is the unique solution to (2) is equivalent to showing that $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{0}$. Hence, the proof resorts to verifying the three conditions in Lemma 6.

Since $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 1, we have

$$k_T \leq \alpha \frac{m}{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log^2 n}, \quad k_{\max} \leq \gamma \frac{m}{\kappa_{\max}}, \quad \alpha \leq \frac{1}{9600}, \quad \gamma \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Considering $\kappa_{max} \geq 1$, we know that condition i) in Lemma 6 holds. By result i) of Lemma 5, condition ii) also holds. Therefore, it remains to verify condition iii), namely, $\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{0}$.

Consider the term $\langle\overline{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \lambda\langle\text{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \mathbf{F}\rangle$ at the right-hand side of result ii) in Lemma 5. From (16), it follows

$$\overline{\mathbf{V}} = \left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathbf{w}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathbf{w}_L\right] - \mathcal{P}_{T^c}\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathbf{w}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathbf{w}_L\right],$$

and consequently

$$\langle\overline{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{H}\rangle = \left\langle\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathbf{w}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathbf{w}_L\right], \mathbf{H}\right\rangle - \left\langle\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathbf{w}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathbf{w}_L\right], \mathbf{H}\right\rangle. \tag{20}$$

By adjoint relation $\left\langle\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathbf{w}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathbf{w}_L\right], \mathbf{H}\right\rangle = \langle\mathbf{W}, \left[\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L\right]\rangle$ and the fact $\mathbf{F} = \left[\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L\right]$, (20) gives

$$\langle\overline{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{H}\rangle = \langle\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{F}\rangle - \left\langle\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathbf{w}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathbf{w}_L\right], \mathbf{H}\right\rangle. \tag{21}$$

On the other hand, from (18), $\mathcal{P}_\Omega\mathbf{W} = \lambda\text{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}})$ and hence $\lambda\text{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}) = \mathbf{W} - \mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{W}$. Therefore we have

$$\lambda\langle\text{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \mathbf{F}\rangle = \langle\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{F}\rangle - \langle\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{F}\rangle. \tag{22}$$

Combining (21) and (22) yields

$$\langle\overline{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \lambda\langle\text{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \mathbf{F}\rangle = \langle\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{F}\rangle - \left\langle\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathbf{w}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathbf{w}_L\right], \mathbf{H}\right\rangle. \tag{23}$$

Substituting (23) into result ii) of Lemma 5 gives

$$\begin{aligned}\|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}+\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}+\lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}-\mathbf{F}\|_1 &\geq \|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{2,1}+\lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}\|_1\\ &+\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}-\left\langle\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathbf{w}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathbf{w}_L\right],\mathbf{H}\right\rangle+\lambda\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1+\langle\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{W},\mathbf{F}\rangle. \qquad (24)\end{aligned}$$

From $\|\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathbf{w}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{A}_{(L)}{}'\mathbf{w}_L\right]\|_{2,\infty}<1$ in (17), we know that

$$\begin{aligned}&-\left\langle\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathbf{w}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathbf{w}_L\right],\mathbf{H}\right\rangle\\ \geq&-\left\|\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathbf{w}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathbf{w}_L\right]\right\|_{2,\infty}\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}\\ \geq&-\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1},\end{aligned}$$

where both inequalities turn to equalities if and only if $\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}=0$. From $\|\mathbf{W}\|_\infty<\lambda$ in (19), we know that

$$\langle\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{W},\mathbf{F}\rangle\geq-\|\mathbf{W}\|_\infty\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1\geq-\lambda\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1,$$

where both inequalities turn to equalities turns to equality if and only if $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1=0$. Therefore, (24) leads to

$$\|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}+\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}+\lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}-\mathbf{F}\|_1\geq\|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{2,1}+\lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}\|_1, \qquad (25)$$

where the inequality turns to an equality if and only if $\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}=0$ and $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1=0$.

Since by hypothesis $(\overline{\mathbf{Y}}+\mathbf{H},\overline{\mathbf{S}}-\mathbf{F})$ is the optimal solution pair, the inequality in (25) must be an equality. Therefore, it follows that $\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}=0$ and $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1=0$, which complete the proof. ■

It is generally difficult to directly construct an exact dual certificate. Thus, following [25] and [26], we perturb the constraints (16)-(19) by making (17) and (19) more stringent, which in turn relaxes (16) and (18).

B. Inexact Dual Certificate

Theorem 3: (Inexact Duality) Suppose that $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}\in\mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{S}}\in\mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$ are the true group sparse signal and sparse error matrices satisfying the assumptions in Theorem 1. The pair $(\overline{\mathbf{Y}},\overline{\mathbf{S}})$ is the unique solution to the RGL model (2) if the parameter $\lambda<1$ and there exists a dual certificate $(\mathbf{W},\mathbf{V})\in\mathcal{R}^{m\times L}\times\mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ such that

$$\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{V}-\overline{\mathbf{V}}\|_F\leq\frac{\lambda}{4\sqrt{\kappa_{\max}}}, \qquad (26)$$

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{V}\|_{2,\infty}\leq\frac{1}{4}, \qquad (27)$$

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{W}\|_\infty\leq\frac{\lambda}{4}, \qquad (28)$$

and

$$\mathbf{V} = \left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^c}\mathbf{w}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^c}\mathbf{w}_L\right] + \lambda\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1), \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right], \tag{29}$$

where $\overline{\mathbf{V}} \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{P}_T\overline{\mathbf{V}})^i = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{y}}^i}{\|\bar{\mathbf{y}}^i\|_2}$ and $(\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\overline{\mathbf{V}})^i = \mathbf{0}$.

Proof: Suppose that $(\overline{\mathbf{Y}} + \mathbf{H}, \overline{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{F})$ is an optimal solution pair to (2). As discussed in the proof of Theorem 2, it is enough to show that $\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{0}$.

Consider the term $\langle\overline{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \lambda\langle\mathrm{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \mathbf{F}\rangle$ in result ii) of Lemma 5. Using the equation $\mathbf{V} = \mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{V} + \mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{V}$, we rewrite the term as

$$\langle\overline{\mathbf{V}}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \lambda\langle\mathrm{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \mathbf{F}\rangle = \langle\overline{\mathbf{V}} - \mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \langle\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{H}\rangle + \langle\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \lambda\langle\mathrm{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \mathbf{F}\rangle. \tag{30}$$

Consider the term $\langle\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \lambda\langle\mathrm{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \mathbf{F}\rangle$ on the right hand side of (30). By (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \lambda\langle\mathrm{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \mathbf{F}\rangle \\
=&\left\langle\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^c}\mathbf{w}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^c}\mathbf{w}_L\right], \mathbf{H}\right\rangle \\
&+ \lambda\left\langle\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1), \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right], \mathbf{H}\right\rangle - \lambda\langle\mathrm{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \mathbf{F}\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

By adjoint relations of inner products, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^c}\mathbf{w}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^c}\mathbf{w}_L\right], \mathbf{H}\right\rangle \\
=&\left\langle\left[\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^c}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^c}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L\right], \mathbf{W}\right\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1), \cdots, \mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right], \mathbf{H}\rangle \\
=&\langle\mathrm{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \left[\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L\right]\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \lambda\langle\mathrm{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \mathbf{F}\rangle \\
=&\left\langle\left[\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^c}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^c}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L\right], \mathbf{W}\right\rangle \\
&+ \lambda\left\langle\mathrm{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \left[\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L\right]\right\rangle - \lambda\langle\mathrm{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}), \mathbf{F}\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

According to conclusion i) in Lemma 5, which is $\left[\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L\right] = \mathbf{F}$, it follows

$$\langle\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \lambda\langle\mathrm{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}, \mathbf{F})\rangle = \langle\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{W}\rangle.$$

Combining (30) and above equality gives

$$\langle\overline{\mathbf{V}},\mathbf{H}\rangle-\lambda\langle\mathrm{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}),\mathbf{F}\rangle=\langle\overline{\mathbf{V}}-\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{V},\mathbf{H}\rangle-\langle\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{V},\mathbf{H}\rangle+\langle\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F},\mathbf{W}\rangle. \tag{31}$$

Next, we manage to find out a lower bound for the right-hand side of the equality (31). First, by (26),

$$\langle\overline{\mathbf{V}}-\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{V},\mathbf{H}\rangle\geq-\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{V}-\mathbf{V}_0\|_F\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F\geq-\frac{\lambda}{4\sqrt{\kappa_{\max}}}\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F.$$

Then, by (27),

$$-\langle\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{V},\mathbf{H}\rangle\geq-\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{V}\|_{2,\infty}\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}\geq-\frac{1}{4}\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}.$$

Finally, by (28),

$$\langle\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F},\mathbf{W}\rangle\geq-\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{W}\|_\infty\geq-\frac{\lambda}{4}\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1.$$

Therefore, (31) gives

$$\langle\overline{\mathbf{V}},\mathbf{H}\rangle-\lambda\langle\mathrm{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}),\mathbf{F}\rangle\geq-\frac{\lambda}{4\sqrt{\kappa_{\max}}}\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F-\frac{1}{4}\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}-\frac{\lambda}{4}\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1.$$

Substitute the above inequality into conclusion ii) of Lemma 5 gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}+\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}+\lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}-\mathbf{F}\|_1\\ \geq&\|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{2,1}+\lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}\|_1+\frac{3}{4}\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}+\frac{3\lambda}{4}\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1-\frac{\lambda}{4\sqrt{\kappa_{\max}}}\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F.\end{aligned}$$

Since $(\overline{\mathbf{Y}}+\mathbf{H},\overline{\mathbf{S}}-\mathbf{F})$ is an optimal solution pair to (2), it follows that $\|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}+\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}+\lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}-\mathbf{F}\|_1\leq\|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{2,1}+\lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}\|_1$. Hence, we have

$$\frac{3}{4}\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}+\frac{3\lambda}{4}\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1-\frac{\lambda}{4\sqrt{\kappa_{\max}}}\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F\leq 0. \tag{32}$$

To complete the proof, we need to show that inequality (32) implies $\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}=\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}=\mathbf{0}$. The proof is given in Appendix E using the concentration inequalities in Section II-C. ■

IV. Construction of Dual Certificate

From Theorem 3, we know that proving following the theorem is sufficient for proving Theorem 1.

Theorem 4: Under the assumptions in Theorem 1, with a high probability, there exists a pair of dual certificate $(\mathbf{U},\mathbf{W})$ such that

$$\mathbf{U}=\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^c}\mathbf{w}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^c}\mathbf{w}_L\right],$$

and

$$\left\|\lambda\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1),\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right]\right\|_{2,\infty}\leq\frac{1}{8}, \tag{33}$$

$$\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{U}+\lambda\mathcal{P}_T\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1),\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right]-\overline{\mathbf{V}}\right\|_F\leq\frac{\lambda}{4\sqrt{\kappa_{\max}}}, \tag{34}$$

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{U}\|_{2,\infty}\leq\frac{1}{8}, \tag{35}$$

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{W}\|_\infty\leq\frac{\lambda}{4}, \tag{36}$$

where $\overline{\mathbf{V}}\in\mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{P}_T\overline{\mathbf{V}})^i=\frac{\bar{\mathbf{y}}^i}{\|\bar{\mathbf{y}}^i\|_2}$ and $(\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\overline{\mathbf{V}})^i=\mathbf{0}$, $\forall i=1,\cdots,n$.

Comparing to Theorem 3, Theorem 4 breaks $\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{V}\|_{2,\infty}\leq\frac{1}{4}$ in (27) into two constraints (33) and (35). Thus, Theorem 4 implies that an inexact dual certificate exists with high probability. Therefore, Theorem 1 holds true according to Theorem 3.

The construction procedure follows the golfing scheme (see [19], [21], and [25]). Basically, it constructs a sequence of matrices $\{\mathbf{Q}_{(j)}\}_{j=0}^l$ via l sampled batches of row vectors in each $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{A}_{(i)},\ i\in\{1,\cdots,L\}$, so that different batches are not overlapped and the sequence $\left\{\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j)}\|_F\right\}_{j=0}^l$ shrinks exponentially fast in finite steps with a high probability. We then write $\mathbf{W}$ and subsequently $\mathbf{U}$ as functions of $\{\mathbf{Q}_{(j)}\}_{j=0}^l$ so that they meet the constraints (33)-(36).

Define the initial value of the sequence $\{\mathbf{Q}_{(j)}\}_{j=0}^l$ as

$$\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}=\overline{\mathbf{V}}-\lambda\mathcal{P}_T[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1),\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)]. \tag{37}$$

For each $i=1,\cdots,L$, we split the maximal non-corrupted set Ω_i^* into l disjoint batch sets, namely, $\Omega_i^*\supseteq K_{i1}\bigcup\cdots\bigcup K_{il}$, so that for any $j=1,\cdots,l$, the cardinalities of the sets $|K_{ij}|$ satisfy $|K_{1j}|=\cdots=|K_{Lj}|\triangleq m_j$. Notice that it is possible to split Ω_i^* in this way since we enforce $|\Omega_1^*|=\cdots=|\Omega_L^*|=m-k_{\max}$.

Define $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i,j)}=\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{K_{ij}}\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$ and the total number of batches $l\triangleq\lfloor\log n+1\rfloor$. For each $j=1,\cdots,l$, recursively define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{Q}_{(j)}&=\left[\mathcal{P}_T\left(\mathbf{I}-\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1},\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\left(\mathbf{I}-\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right]\\&=\left[\left(\prod_{r=1}^j\mathcal{P}_T\left(\mathbf{I}-\frac{m}{m_r}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,r)}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right)\mathbf{q}_{(0)1},\cdots,\left(\prod_{r=1}^j\mathcal{P}_T\left(\mathbf{I}-\frac{m}{m_r}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,r)}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right)\mathbf{q}_{(0)L}\right].\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Furthermore, notice that $k_{\max}\leq\gamma\frac{m}{\kappa_{\max}}$ with $\gamma\leq\frac{1}{4}$. We choose

$$m_1=m_2=\frac{m}{4},\quad m_j=\frac{m}{4\log n},\forall j\geq 3.$$

The following lemma shows that $\left\{\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j)}\|_F\right\}_{j=0}^l$ shrinks exponentially fast with a high probability.

Lemma 7: Given $k_T \leq \alpha \frac{m}{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log^2 n}$ with $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{256}$, then, with probability at least $1-2n^{-1}$, the following set of inequalities hold simultaneously

$$\left\| \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T,\ \cdots,\ \mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T \right\} \right\|_{(2,2)} \leq c_j, \tag{39}$$

where $c_1 = c_2 = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log n}}$ and $c_j = \frac{1}{2},\ j \geq 3$.

Proof: Following the proof of Lemma 3, for any $i = 1, \cdots, L$ and $j = 1, \cdots, l$ we have

$$Pr\left\{ \left\| \mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i,j)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T \right\|_{(2,2)} \geq \tau \right\} \leq 2k_T \exp\left(-\frac{m_j}{\kappa_i k_T \mu_i} \frac{\tau^2}{4(1+\frac{2\tau}{3})} \right).$$

Next, same as the proof of (10) and (11), for each $j = 1, \cdots, l$, taking a union bound over all $i = 1, \cdots, L$, which gives

$$\begin{aligned} &Pr\left\{ \left\| \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T,\ \cdots,\ \mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T \right\} \right\|_{(2,2)} \geq \tau \right\} \\ \leq & 2k_T L \exp\left\{ -\frac{m_j}{k_T \mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}} \frac{\tau^2}{4(1+\frac{2\tau}{3})} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

If $j \geq 3$, then substituting $\tau = \frac{1}{2}$ and $m_j = \frac{m}{4\log n}$ into above inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} &Pr\left\{ \left\| \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T,\ \cdots,\ \mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T \right\} \right\|_{(2,2)} \geq \tau \right\} \\ \leq & 2k_T L \exp\left\{ -\frac{3}{256}\frac{m}{k_T \mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log n} \right\} \\ \leq & 2k_T L \exp\left\{-3\log n\right\} \leq 2n^{-2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from $k_T \leq \alpha \frac{m}{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log^2 n}$ and $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{256}$. If $j \leq 2$, then substituting $\tau = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log n}}$ and $m_j = \frac{m}{4}$ into (40) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &Pr\left\{ \left\| \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T,\ \cdots,\ \mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)} - \mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T \right\} \right\|_{(2,2)} \geq \tau \right\} \\ \leq & 2k_T L \exp\left\{ -\frac{3}{64}\frac{m}{k_T \mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}} \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{\log n(3\sqrt{\log n}+1)} \right\} \\ \leq & 2k_T L \exp\left\{ -\frac{3}{256}\frac{m}{k_T \mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}} \frac{1}{\log n} \right\} \\ \leq & 2k_T L \exp\left\{-3\log n\right\} \leq 2n^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now taking a union bound over all $j = 1, \cdots, l$ gives

$$Pr\left\{\text{(39) holds for all } j = 1, \cdots, l\right\} \geq 1 - 2n^{-2}l \geq 1 - 2n^{-2}(\log n + 1) \geq 1 - 2n^{-1},$$

which finishes the proof. ■

From Lemma 7, the following chains of contractions hold with probability at least $1-2n^{-1}$:

$$\|\mathbf{Q}_{(1)}\|_F \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log n}}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}\|_F, \tag{41}$$

$$\|\mathbf{Q}_{(2)}\|_F \leq \frac{1}{4\log n}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}\|_F,$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\|\mathbf{Q}_{(l)}\|_F \leq \prod_{j=1}^{l} c_j \|\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}\|_F \leq \frac{1}{\log n}\frac{1}{2^l}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}\|_F. \tag{42}$$

Finally, we set $\mathbf{W}$ so that

$$\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{W} = \left[\sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{m}{m_j}\mathcal{P}_{K_{1j}}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1}, \cdots, \sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{m}{m_j}\mathcal{P}_{K_{Lj}}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right], \tag{43}$$

and $\mathcal{P}_\Omega\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{0}$. Also, set $\mathbf{U}$ to be

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{U} &= \left[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^c}\mathbf{w}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^c}\mathbf{w}_L\right] \\ &= \left[\sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{m}{m_j}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_{K_{1j}}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1}, \cdots, \sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{m}{m_j}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_{K_{Lj}}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{m}{m_j}\left[\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1}, \cdots, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right].\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Having set all of these, we are now ready to prove Theorem 4. The proof is given in Appendix F .

V. CONCLUSION

This paper proposes the robust group lasso (RGL) model that recovers a group sparse signal matrix for sparsely corrupted measurements. The RGL model minimizes the mixed $\ell_{2,1}/\ell_1$-norm under linear measurement constraints, and hence is convex. We establish the recoverability of the RGL model, showing that the true group sparse signal matrix and the sparse error matrix can be exactly recovered with a high probability under certain conditions. Our theoretical analysis provides a solid performance guarantee to the RGL model.

APPENDIX A
PROOF OF LEMMA 3

Proof: Here we prove the second part of Lemma 3. By definitions $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1} - \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\right)\mathcal{P}_T \\
=&\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{A}_{(i)}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1} - \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\right)\mathcal{P}_T \\
=&\sum_{j\in\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{M}_{(j)},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{M}_{(j)} \triangleq \frac{1}{m-k_{\max}}\mathcal{P}_T\left(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1} - \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\right)\mathcal{P}_T.$$

Since $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\right] = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}$, it is obvious that that $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{M}_{(j)}\right] = 0$. We estimate the induced $\ell_{(2,2)}$-norm of $\mathbf{M}_{(j)}$ in order to implement the matrix Berstein inequality later. It holds

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{M}_{(j)}\|_{(2,2)} =& \left\|\frac{1}{m-k_{\max}}\mathcal{P}_T\left(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1} - \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\|_{(2,2)} \\
\leq& \frac{1}{m-k_{\max}}\left(\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\left(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\|_{(2,2)} + \left\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\right\|_{(2,2)}\right) \\
\leq& \frac{1}{m-k_{\max}}\left(\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\left(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\|_{(2,2)} + \kappa_i\right) \\
=& \frac{1}{m-k_{\max}}\left(\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\right\|_2^2 + \kappa_i\right) \leq \frac{1}{m-k_{\max}}(\mu_i k_T + \kappa_i),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the triangle inequality and the last inequality follows from Assumption (7). Since $\kappa_i \geq 1$ and $\mu_i \geq 1$, the above bound on $\|\mathbf{M}_{(j)}\|_{(2,2)}$ can be further relaxed as

$$\|\mathbf{M}_{(j)}\|_{(2,2)} \leq \frac{2\kappa_i\mu_i k_T}{m-k_{\max}} \triangleq B.$$

Meanwhile, since $\mathbf{M}'_{(j)}\mathbf{M}_{(j)} = \mathbf{M}_{(j)}\mathbf{M}'_{(j)}$, we only need to consider one of them.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{M}'_{(j)}\mathbf{M}_{(j)}\right]\right\|_{(2,2)}\\
=&\frac{1}{(m-k_{\max})^2}\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\left(\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\right)\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T-\left(\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\right)^2\right]\right\|_{(2,2)}\\
=&\frac{1}{(m-k_{\max})^2}\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\right\|_2^2\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i,j)}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\right]-\left(\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\right)^2\right\|_{(2,2)}\\
\leq&\frac{1}{(m-k_{\max})^2}\left(\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\right\|_2^2\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i,j)}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\right]\right\|_{(2,2)}+\kappa_i^2\right)\\
\leq&\frac{1}{(m-k_{\max})^2}\left(\mu_i k_T\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\right]\right\|_{(2,2)}+\kappa_i^2\right)\\
\leq&\frac{\kappa_i\mu_i k_T+\kappa_i^2}{(m-k_{\max})^2}\leq\frac{\kappa_i^2(\mu_i k_T+1)}{(m-k_{\max})^2}\leq\frac{2\kappa_i^2\mu_i k_T}{(m-k_{\max})^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from straight-up calculation using $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\right]=\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}$. The first inequality follows from triangle inequality, the second inequality follows from the definition of incoherence (7), and the rest of the inequalities uses the fact that $\kappa_i\geq 1$ and $\mu_i\geq 1$. Thus, by triangle inequality,

$$\left\|\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j\in\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{M}'_{(j)}\mathbf{M}_{(j)}\right]\right\|_{(2,2)}\leq\frac{2\kappa_i^2\mu_i k_T}{(m-k_{\max})^2}\cdot(m-k_{\max})=\frac{2\kappa_i^2\mu_i k_T}{m-k_{\max}}\triangleq\sigma^2.$$

Plugging B and σ^2 into the Matrix Berstein inequality, we finish the proof of Lemma 3. ■

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF LEMMA 4

Proof: We use the vector Berstein inequality to prove the lemma. Picking any $k\in T^c$ and any $i\in\{1,\cdots,L\}$, we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}\mathbf{e}_k=\frac{1}{m}\sum_{j\in\Omega_i^*}\langle\mathbf{a}_{(i)j},\mathbf{e}_k\rangle\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j},$$

Letting

$$\mathbf{g}_{(i,j)}=\frac{1}{m}\langle\mathbf{a}_{(i)j},\mathbf{e}_k\rangle\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j},$$

then it holds

$$\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}\mathbf{e}_k=\sum_{j\in\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{g}_{(i,j)}. \tag{45}$$

Since $\{\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\}_{j\in\Omega_i^*}$ are i.i.d. samples from $\mathcal{F}_i$, the sequence of vectors $\left\{\mathbf{g}_{(i,j)}\right\}_{j\in\Omega_i^*}$ are i.i.d. random variables. In order to apply the vector Berstein inequality, we first need to show that $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}_{(i,j)}\right]=0$ for

any $j \in \Omega_i^*$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}_{(i,j)}\right] = \frac{1}{m}\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \mathbf{a}_{(i)j}, \mathbf{e}_k\rangle \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\right] = \frac{1}{m}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\right]\mathbf{e}_k = \frac{1}{m}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{e}_k = 0.$$

The last equality is true since $k \in T^c$. Second, we calculate the bound B for any single $\left\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,j)}\right\|_2$:

$$\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,j)}\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{m^2}|\langle \mathbf{a}_{(i)j}, \mathbf{e}_k\rangle|^2 \|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\mu_i \|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\|_2^2}{m^2} \leq \frac{\mu_i^2 k_T}{m^2},$$

where the first inequality follows from the incoherence condition (6) and the second inequality follows from (7). Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,j)}\right\|_2^2\right] =& \frac{1}{m^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\langle \mathbf{a}_{(i)j}, \mathbf{e}_k\rangle \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\right)'\left(\langle \mathbf{a}_{(i)j}, \mathbf{e}_k\rangle \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\right)\right] \\
\leq& \frac{1}{m^2}\mu_i \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\right] \\
=& \frac{1}{m^2}\mu_i \cdot \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)j}\right]\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\right) \\
=& \frac{1}{m^2}\mu_i \cdot \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\right) \leq \frac{\mu_i k_T \kappa_i}{m^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathrm{Tr}(\cdot)$ denotes the trace of a matrix. The first inequality follows from the incoherence property (6). The last inequality follows from the fact that $\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}$ is of rank at most k_T so that its trace is upper bounded by $k_T\kappa_i$. Thus, it holds

$$\sum_{j\in\Omega_i^*}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,j)}\right\|_2^2\right] \leq \sum_{j\in\Omega_i^*}\frac{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}k_T}{m^2} \leq \frac{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}k_T}{m} \triangleq \sigma^2. \tag{46}$$

Substituting the above bound to the vector Berstein inequality yields

$$Pr\left(\left\|\sum_{j\in\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{g}_{(i,j)}\right\|_2 \geq t\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{\frac{8\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}k_T}{m}} + \frac{1}{4}\right),$$

given $\sigma^2/B = \sqrt{k_1}\kappa_{max} \geq 1$. Let $t = \sqrt{C\log n\frac{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}k_T}{m}}$. Using the fact that $k_T \leq \alpha\frac{m}{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log n}$, it holds $t \leq \sqrt{C\alpha}$ when $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{24}$. we can choose $C = 24$ such that $C\alpha \leq 1$, which guarantees $t \leq 1$ and gives

$$Pr\left(\left\|\sum_{j\in\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{g}_{(i,j)}\right\|_2 \geq 1\right) \leq e^{\frac{1}{4}}n^{-3}.$$

Recalling (45) and taking a union bound over all $k \in T^c$ and $i \in \{1, \cdots, L\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& Pr\left(\max_{i\in\{1,\cdots,L\},k\in T^c}\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}\mathbf{e}_k\right\|_2 \geq 1\right) \\
\leq& \sum_{i=1}^{L}\sum_{k\in T^c} Pr\left(\left\|\sum_{j\in\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{g}_{(i,j)}\right\|_2 \geq 1\right) \\
\leq& k_T L e^{\frac{1}{4}}n^{-3} \leq e^{\frac{1}{4}}n^{-2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact $k_T L \leq n$. This completes the proof. ■

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF LEMMA 5

Proof: Since $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ are the true group sparse signal and sparse error matrices, respectively, they satisfy the measurement equation

$$\mathbf{M} = [\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\bar{\mathbf{y}}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}\bar{\mathbf{y}}_L] + \overline{\mathbf{S}}.$$

Furthermore, since $(\overline{\mathbf{Y}} + \mathbf{H}, \overline{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{F})$ is an optimal solution to the RGL model (2), they must also satisfy the constraint

$$\mathbf{M} = [\mathbf{A}_{(1)}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_1 + \mathbf{h}_1), \cdots, \mathbf{A}_{(L)}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}_L + \mathbf{h}_L)] + \overline{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{F}.$$

Subtracting these two equations yields result i) of Lemma 5.

Since the objective function of (2) is convex, we obtain an inequality

$$\|\overline{\mathbf{Y}} + \mathbf{H}\|_{2,1} + \lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{F}\|_1 \geq \|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{2,1} + \lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}\|_1 + \langle \partial\|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{2,1}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \lambda\langle \partial\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}\|_1, \mathbf{F}\rangle, \tag{47}$$

where $\partial\|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{2,1}$ denotes a subgradient of the $\ell_{2,1}$-norm at $\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$ and $\partial\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}\|_1$ denotes a subgradient of the ℓ_1-norm at $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$. Furthermore, the corresponding subgradients can be written as

$$\partial\|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{2,1} = \overline{\mathbf{V}} + \overline{\mathbf{R}},$$

$$\partial\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}\|_1 = \text{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}) + \overline{\mathbf{Q}},$$

where $\overline{\mathbf{V}} \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ satisfies $(\mathcal{P}_T\overline{\mathbf{V}})^i = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{y}}^i}{\|\bar{\mathbf{y}}^i\|_2}$ and $(\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\overline{\mathbf{V}})^i = \mathbf{0}$, $\forall i = 1, \cdots, n$; $\overline{\mathbf{R}} \in \mathcal{R}^{n\times L}$ satisfies $\mathcal{P}_T\overline{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\overline{\mathbf{R}}\|_{2,\infty} \leq 1$; $\overline{\mathbf{Q}} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$ satisfies $\mathcal{P}_\Omega\overline{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\overline{\mathbf{Q}}\|_\infty \leq 1$. Therefore, we have

$$\|\overline{\mathbf{Y}} + \mathbf{H}\|_{2,1} + \lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{F}\|_1 \geq \|\overline{\mathbf{Y}}\|_{2,1} + \lambda\|\overline{\mathbf{S}}\|_1 + \langle \overline{\mathbf{V}} + \overline{\mathbf{R}}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \lambda\langle sgn(\overline{\mathbf{S}}) + \overline{\mathbf{Q}}, \mathbf{F}\rangle, \tag{48}$$

for any $\overline{\mathbf{R}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}$ satisfying the conditions mentioned above.

We construct a specific pair of $\overline{\mathbf{R}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}$ in the following way. Let

$$\bar{\mathbf{r}}^i = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbf{h}^i}{\|\mathbf{h}^i\|_2}, & \text{if } \mathbf{h}^i \neq \mathbf{0}' \text{ and } i \in T^c; \\ \mathbf{0}', & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{h}^i$ and $\bar{\mathbf{r}}^i$ are the i-th row of $\mathbf{H}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{R}}$, respectively. Meanwhile, let $\overline{\mathbf{Q}} = -\text{sgn}(\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F})$. It follows that

$$\langle \overline{\mathbf{R}}, \mathbf{H}\rangle = \|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1},$$

$$\langle \overline{\mathbf{Q}}, \mathbf{F}\rangle = -\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1.$$

Substituting the above equalities into (48) gives result ii) of Lemma 5. ■

APPENDIX D
PROOF OF LEMMA 6

Proof: We first show that $\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}=\mathbf{0}$. Since $\left[\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L\right]=\mathbf{F}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}=\mathbf{0}$, it holds

$$[\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^c}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^c}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L]=0.$$

Meanwhile, $\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}=\mathbf{0}$ implies $[\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^c}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{h}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^c}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{h}_L]=0$. Therefore, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}&[\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^c}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{h}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^c}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{h}_L]\\ =&[\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^c}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^c}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L]-[\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^c}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{h}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^c}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{h}_L]=\mathbf{0}.\end{aligned}$$

Since for any $i=1,\cdots,L$, Ω_i^* is a subset of Ω_i^c, it follows

$$\left[\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^*}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{h}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^*}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{h}_L\right]=\mathbf{0},$$

and consequently

$$\begin{aligned}&\textbf{Blkdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_T,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_T\right\}\cdot\text{vec}(\mathbf{H})\\ =&\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\text{vec}\left(\left[\mathcal{P}_T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}'\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^*}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{h}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}'\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^*}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{h}_L\right]\right)\\ =&\mathbf{0}.\end{aligned}$$

This equality implies

$$\left\|\textbf{Blkdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}-\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}-\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\}\cdot\text{vec}(\mathbf{H})\right\|_2=\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F.$$

On the other hand, according to (11), it follows with a high probability

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\textbf{Blkdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}-\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}-\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\}\cdot\text{vec}(\mathbf{H})\right\|_2\\ \le&\left\|\textbf{Blkdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}-\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}-\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\}\right\|_{(2,2)}\cdot\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F\\ \le&\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log n}}\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F.\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F\le\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log n}}\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F,$$

which implies $\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}=\mathbf{0}$. Because $\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}=\mathbf{0}$, we have $\mathbf{H}=\mathbf{0}$. Since $\mathbf{F}=\left[\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L\right]$, it follows that $\mathbf{F}=0$. ■

APPENDIX E
FINISHING THE PROOF OF THEOREM 3: INEXACT DUALITY

This section is dedicated to proving that with a high probability (32) implies $\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}=\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}=\mathbf{0}$. To do so, we first derive an upper bound for $\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F$, expressed as a linear combination of $\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}$ and $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1$.

Using (10), it follows

$$\left\|\mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}-\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}-\mathbf{I}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right\}\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{H})\right\|_2\leq\frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F.$$

Since $\|\mathbf{BLKdiag}\{\mathcal{P}_T,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\}\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{H})\|_2=\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F$, applying the triangle inequality yields

$$\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F\leq 2\left\|\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_T,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_T\right\}\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{H})\right\|_2.$$

Observing $\mathrm{vec}(\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H})=\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{H})-\mathrm{vec}(\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H})$ and using the triangle inequality again, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F\leq&2\left\|\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)},\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}\right\}\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{H})\right\|_2\\&+2\left\|\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)},\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}\right\}\mathrm{vec}(\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H})\right\|_2.\end{aligned}\tag{49}$$

Below, we upper bound the two terms at the right-hand side of (49), respectively.

① **Bounding the First Term of** (49)**:** By definitions $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}=\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^*}\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$, it follows

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)},\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}\right\}\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{H})\right\|_2\\=&\left\|\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\mathrm{vec}\left(\left[\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^*}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^*}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L\right]\right)\right\|_2\\=&\left\|\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\mathrm{vec}\left(\left[\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^*}\mathbf{f}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^*}\mathbf{f}_L\right]\right)\right\|_2.\end{aligned}\tag{50}$$

Here the second equality comes from result i) in Lemma 5, namely, $\mathbf{F}=[\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathbf{h}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathbf{h}_L]$. Recalling that Ω_i^* is a subset of Ω_i^c for any $i=1,\cdots,L$, we have

$$\left\|\mathrm{vec}\left(\left[\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^*}\mathbf{f}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^*}\mathbf{f}_L\right]\right)\right\|_2\leq\|\mathrm{vec}(\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F})\|_2.$$

Based on this inequality, we upper bound (50) using the induced norm property

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{m}{m-k_{\max}} \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}, \cdots, \mathcal{P}_T \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)} \right\} \mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{H}) \right\|_2 \\
\leq & \left\| \frac{m}{m-k_{\max}} \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1} \mathbf{A}'_{(1)} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^*}, \cdots, \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1} \mathbf{A}'_{(L)} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^*} \right\} \right\|_{(2,2)} \\
& \cdot \left\| \mathrm{vec}\left(\left[\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^*} \mathbf{f}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^*} \mathbf{f}_L \right] \right) \right\|_2 \\
\leq & \left\| \frac{m}{m-k_{\max}} \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1} \mathbf{A}'_{(1)} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^*}, \cdots, \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1} \mathbf{A}'_{(L)} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^*} \right\} \right\|_{(2,2)} \cdot \| \mathrm{vec}(\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c} \mathbf{F}) \|_2 \\
\leq & \left\| \frac{m}{m-k_{\max}} \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1} \mathbf{A}'_{(1)} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^*}, \cdots, \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1} \mathbf{A}'_{(L)} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^*} \right\} \right\|_{(2,2)} \cdot \| \mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c} \mathbf{F} \|_1 . \qquad (51)
\end{aligned}$$

Using the definitions $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1} \mathbf{A}'_{(i)} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i^*} \mathbf{A}_{(i)}$ and applying the triangle inequality as well as Corollary 2, with a high probability it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{m}{m-k_{\max}} \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1} \mathbf{A}'_{(1)} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^*} \mathbf{A}_{(1)} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T, \cdots, \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1} \mathbf{A}'_{(L)} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^*} \mathbf{A}_{(L)} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T \right\} \right\|_{(2,2)} \\
= & \left\| \frac{m}{m-k_{\max}} \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T, \cdots, \mathcal{P}_T \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T \right\} \right\|_{(2,2)} \\
\leq & \left\| \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T \left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1} - \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1} \right) \mathcal{P}_T, \ \cdots, \ \mathcal{P}_T \left(\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1} - \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1} \right) \mathcal{P}_T \right\} \right\|_{(2,2)} \\
& + \left\| \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T, \cdots, \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T \right\} \right\|_{(2,2)} \\
\leq & \frac{\kappa_{\max}}{2} + \left\| \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T, \cdots, \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_T \right\} \right\|_{(2,2)} \leq \frac{3}{2} \kappa_{\max}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\left\| \sqrt{\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}} \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(1)}^{-1} \mathbf{A}'_{(1)} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_1^*}, \ \cdots, \ \mathcal{P}_T \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(L)}^{-1} \mathbf{A}'_{(L)} \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_L^*} \right\} \right\|_{(2,2)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{3}{2} \kappa_{\max}}.$$

Combining (51), this gives

$$\left\| \frac{m}{m-k_{\max}} \mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{ \mathcal{P}_T \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}, \cdots, \mathcal{P}_T \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)} \right\} \mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{H}) \right\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{3}{2} \frac{\kappa_{\max} m}{m-k_{\max}}} \left\| \mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c} \mathbf{F} \right\|_1 .$$

② **Bounding the Second Term of** (49)**:** The following chains of equalities and inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)},\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}\right\}\mathrm{vec}(\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H})\right\|_2\\
=&\left\|\left[\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{h}_1,\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{h}_L\right]\right\|_F\\
=&\left\|\sum_{k\in T^c}\left[h_{1k}\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}\mathbf{e}_k,\cdots,h_{Lk}\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}\mathbf{e}_k\right]\right\|_F\\
\le&\sum_{k\in T^c}\left\|\left[h_{1k}\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)}\mathbf{e}_k,\cdots,h_{Lk}\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}\mathbf{e}_k\right]\right\|_F\\
=&\sum_{k\in T^c}\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}\mathbf{e}_k\right\|_2^2\cdot|h_{ik}|^2}\\
\le&\sum_{k\in T^c}\left(\max_{i\in\{1,\cdots,L\}}\left\{\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}\mathbf{e}_k\right\|_2\right\}\right)\cdot\left\|\mathbf{h}^k\right\|_2\\
\le&\left(\max_{i\in\{1,\cdots,L\},\ k\in T^c}\left\{\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i)}\mathbf{e}_k\right\|_2\right\}\right)\cdot\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}\,,
\end{aligned}\tag{52}$$

where $\mathbf{h}^k$ denotes the k-th row of matrix $\mathbf{H}$ and h_{ik} denotes the (i,k)-th element of $\mathbf{H}$. In (52), the last inequality follows from the definition of the $\ell_{2,1}$-norm. According to Lemma 4, with a high probability, (52) implies

$$\left\|\mathbf{BLKdiag}\left\{\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1)},\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L)}\right\}\mathrm{vec}(\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H})\right\|_2\le\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}.$$

Summarizing the results above, we have an upper bound for the right-hand side of (49):

$$\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{H}\|_F\le\sqrt{\frac{6\kappa_{\max}m}{m-k_{\max}}}\,\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1+\frac{2m}{m-k_{\max}}\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}.\tag{53}$$

Finally, substituting (53) into (32) gives

$$\left(\frac{3}{4}-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\kappa_{\max}}}\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}\lambda\right)\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}+\left(\frac{3}{4}-\frac{\sqrt{6}}{4}\sqrt{\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}}\right)\lambda\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1\le 0.$$

In the above inequality, $\frac{3}{4}-\frac{\sqrt{6}}{4}\sqrt{\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}}$ and $\frac{3}{4}-\frac{\lambda}{2\sqrt{\kappa_{\max}}}\frac{m}{m-k_{\max}}$ are both larger that zero provided that $\lambda<1$ and $\frac{k_{\max}}{m}\le\frac{\gamma}{\kappa_{\max}}<\frac{1}{3}$. Thus, we have $\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}\|_{2,1}=0$ and $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}\|_1=0$, which prove $\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{H}=\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{F}=\mathbf{0}$.

APPENDIX F
PROOF OF THEOREM 4: EXISTENCE OF INEXACT DUAL CERTIFICATE

① **Bounding the Initial Value:** $\left\|\lambda\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1),\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right]\right\|_{2,\infty}\le\frac{1}{8}$.

Proof: It is sufficient to prove

$$\left\|\lambda\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1),\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right]\right\|_{2,\infty}\le\frac{1}{8}.\tag{54}$$

Let $\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^r$ be the r-th row of $\sqrt{m}\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}$ and $a_{(i)rj}$ be the (r,j)-th element in $\sqrt{m}\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}$. Since $\text{sgn}\left(\overline{\mathbf{S}}\right)$ is an i.i.d. Rademacher random matrix (because of i.i.d. signs), for any $r = 1, \cdots, n$, we claim the following probability bound for the row ℓ_2-norm holds:

$$Pr\left\{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^r \text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i)|^2} - \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^r \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\|_2^2} \geq t\right\} \leq 4\exp\left\{-t^2 \Big/ \left(16\sum_{i=1}^{L}\|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^r \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\|_2^2\right)\right\}. \quad (55)$$

The proof of (55) follows from Corollary 4.10 in [27]. The details are given below.

According to Corollary 4.10 in [27], if $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{R}^{m\times L}$ is distributed according to some product measure on $[-1,1]^{m\times L}$ and there exists a function $f:\ \mathcal{R}^{m\times L} \to \mathcal{R}$ which is convex and K-Lipschitz, then it holds

$$Pr\{|f(\mathbf{Z}) - \mathbb{E}\left[f(\mathbf{Z})\right]| \geq t\} \leq 4\exp\left\{-\frac{t^2}{16K^2}\right\}.$$

Here we take $\mathbf{Z} = \text{sgn}\left(\overline{\mathbf{S}}\right)$ and $f(\cdot) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^r \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}(\cdot)|^2}$. Notice that $\text{sgn}\left(\overline{\mathbf{S}}\right)$ is entry-wise Bernoulli and the function f we choose is convex with the Lipschitz constant $K \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left\|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^r \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\right\|_2^2}$, the requirements in above proposition are satisfied. In order to bound $\mathbb{E}\left[f(\mathbf{Z})\right]$ from above, we first compute $\mathbb{E}\left[f(\mathbf{Z})^2\right]$ and then use the property that $\mathbb{E}\left[f(\mathbf{Z})\right] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[f(\mathbf{Z})^2\right]}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[f(\mathbf{Z})^2\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^r \text{sgn}(\overline{\mathbf{s}}_i)\right|^2\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left|\sum_{j=1}^{m} a_{(i)rj}\text{sgn}(\bar{s}_{ij})\right|^2\right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{L}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\sum_{j=1}^{m} a_{(i)rj}\text{sgn}(\bar{s}_{ij})\right|^2\right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{L}\sum_{j=1}^{m}\sum_{k=1}^{m} a_{(i)rj}a_{(i)rk}\text{sgn}(\bar{s}_{ij})\text{sgn}(\bar{s}_{ik}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{L}\left\|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^r \mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\right\|_2^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the fact that for each $i = 1, \cdots, L$, $\text{sgn}(\mathbf{s}_i)$ is a random vector with

nonzero entries i.i.d. so that all cross terms vanish. Thus, $\mathbb{E}\left[f(\mathbf{Z})\right] \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left\|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^{r}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\right\|_2^2}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&Pr\left\{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^{r}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i)\right|^2}-\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left\|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^{r}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\right\|_2^2}\geq t\right\}\\
\leq&Pr\left\{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^{r}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i)\right|^2}-\mathbb{E}\left[f(\mathbf{Z})\right]\geq t\right\}\\
\leq&Pr\left\{\left|\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^{r}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i)\right|^2}-\mathbb{E}\left[f(\mathbf{Z})\right]\right|\geq t\right\}\\
\leq&4\exp\left\{-\frac{t^2}{16K^2}\right\}\leq 4\exp\left\{t^2\Big/\left(16\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left\|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^{r}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\right\|_2^2\right)\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

which proves (55).

Next, choose $t=6\sqrt{\log n}\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left\|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^{r}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\right\|_2^2}$. Then with probability exceeding $1-4\exp\left\{-\frac{9}{4}\log n\right\}=1-4n^{-\frac{9}{4}}$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^{r}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i)\right|^2}&\leq\lambda\left(6\sqrt{\log n}+1\right)\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left\|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^{r}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\right\|_2^2}\\
&\leq 7\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left\|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^{r}\mathcal{P}_{\Omega_i}\right\|_2^2}\leq 7\sqrt{\mu_{\max}k_\Omega},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second last inequality follows from $\lambda=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log n}}$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log n}}\leq 1$, while the last inequality follows from the definition of incoherence parameter in (6) and the fact that $|\Omega|=k_\Omega$. Taking a union bound over all $r=1,\cdots,n$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&Pr\left\{\left\|\lambda\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\left[\mathbf{A}_{(1)}'\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1)\ \cdots\ \mathbf{A}_{(L)}'\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right]\right\|_{2,\infty}\geq 7\sqrt{\frac{\mu_{\max}k_\Omega}{m}}\right\}\\
=&Pr\left\{\max_{r\in\{1,2,\cdots,n\}}\left\{\lambda\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^{r}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i)\right|^2}\right\}\geq 7\sqrt{\mu_{\max}k_\Omega}\right\}\\
\leq&\sum_{r=1}^{n}Pr\left\{\lambda\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{L}\left|\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^{r}\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i)\right|^2}\geq 7\sqrt{\mu_{\max}k_\Omega}\right\}\\
\leq&4n^{-\frac{9}{4}}\cdot n=4n^{-\frac{5}{4}}\leq 4n^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from the definition of $\mathbf{a}_{(i)}^{r}$. Substituting the bounds $k_\Omega\leq\beta\frac{m}{\mu_{\max}}$ and $\beta\leq\frac{1}{3136}$ into the above inequality finally gives

$$Pr\left\{\left\|\lambda\left[\mathbf{A}_{(1)}'\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1),\cdots,\mathbf{A}_{(L)}'\mathrm{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right]\right\|_{2,\infty}\geq\frac{1}{8}\right\}\leq 4n^{-1},$$

which finishes the proof. ■

② **Bounding the term:** $\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{U}+\lambda\mathcal{P}_T\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1),\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right]-\overline{\mathbf{V}}\right\|_F\leq\frac{\lambda}{4\sqrt{\kappa_{\max}}}$.

Proof: Recalling the definition of $\mathbf{U}$ in (44), we have

$$\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{U}=\mathcal{P}_T\left[\sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1},\cdots,\sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right].$$

According to the definition of $\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}$ in (37), $\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}=\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}$. Since each subsequent mapping from $\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}$ to $\mathbf{Q}_{(j)}$ defined in (38) is a mapping from T to T, it follows that $\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{Q}_{(j)}=\mathbf{Q}_{(j)}$ for any $j=1,\cdots,l$. Therefore, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{U}=&\sum_{j=1}^{l}\left(\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}-\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\right)+\mathcal{P}_T\left[\sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1},\cdots,\sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right]\\
=&\sum_{j=1}^{l}\left(\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}-\left[\mathcal{P}_T\left(\mathbf{I}-\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1},\cdots,\mathcal{P}_T\left(\mathbf{I}-\frac{m}{m_j}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right]\right)\\
=&\sum_{j=1}^{l}\left(\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}-\mathbf{Q}_{(j)}\right)=\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}-\mathbf{Q}_{(l)},\end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality follows from the definition of $\mathbf{Q}_{(j)}$. Thus, substituting the definition of $\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}$ in (37) yields

$$\mathbf{Q}_{(l)}=\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}-\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{U}=\overline{\mathbf{V}}-\lambda\mathcal{P}_T\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1),\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right]-\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{U},$$

which further implies

$$\left\|\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{U}+\lambda\mathcal{P}_T\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1),\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}s\bar{g}n(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right]-\overline{\mathbf{V}}\right\|_F=\|\mathbf{Q}_{(l)}\|_F.$$

Thus, we are able to bound the target function on the left-hand side by bounding $\|\mathbf{Q}_{(l)}\|_F$ instead. It is enough to obtain an upper bound for $\|\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}\|_F$ and apply contractions (41)-(42). From (54), it follows

$$\left\|\lambda\mathcal{P}_T\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1),\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right]\right\|_F\leq\frac{\sqrt{k_T}}{8}.$$

Since $\|\overline{\mathbf{V}}\|_F=\sqrt{k_T}$, by triangle inequality, we have

$$\left\|\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}\right\|=\left\|\lambda\mathcal{P}_T\left[\mathbf{A}'_{(1)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1),\cdots,\mathbf{A}'_{(L)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_L)\right]-\overline{\mathbf{V}}\right\|_F\leq\frac{9\sqrt{k_T}}{8}.\tag{56}$$

Thus, by contractions of $\{\mathbf{Q}_{(j)}\}_{j=1}^{l}$ in (41)-(42), we have

$$\|\mathbf{Q}_{(l)}\|_F\leq\frac{1}{\log n}\frac{1}{2^l}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}\|_F\leq\frac{1}{\log n}\frac{1}{2^l}\frac{9\sqrt{k_T}}{8}\leq\frac{1}{\log n}\frac{1}{n}\frac{9\sqrt{k_T}}{8}\leq\frac{\lambda}{4\sqrt{\kappa_{max}}},$$

provided that $\alpha\leq\frac{4}{81}$, where the last inequality follows from the fact $k_T\leq\alpha\frac{m}{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log n}$, and $\sqrt{m}\leq\sqrt{\mu_{\max}}n\log n$. Furthermore, from the proof, as long as (39) and (54) hold, this bound is guaranteed. ■

③ **Bounding the term:** $\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{U}\|_{2,\infty} \leq \frac{1}{8}$.

Proof: We claim that the following inequality is true with high probability:

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{U}\|_{2,\infty} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{l} \frac{1}{10\sqrt{k_T}} \|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F. \tag{57}$$

According to the definition of $\mathbf{U}$ in (44), it holds

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{U} &= \left[\sum_{j=1}^{l} \frac{m}{m_j}\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1}, \cdots, \sum_{j=1}^{l} \frac{m}{m_j}\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{l}\left[\frac{m}{m_j}\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1}, \cdots, \frac{m}{m_j}\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right].\end{aligned}$$

Thus, it is enough to show that for any $k \in T^c$, it holds

$$\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{l}\left[\frac{m}{m_j}\mathbf{e}_k'\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1}, \cdots, \frac{m}{m_j}\mathbf{e}_k'\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right]\right\|_2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{1}{10\sqrt{k_T}}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F, \tag{58}$$

with a high probability, where $\{\mathbf{e}_k\}_{k=1}^n$ is a standard basis in $\mathcal{R}^n$. By the triangle inequality, a sufficient condition for (58) to satisfy is

$$\sum_{j=1}^{l}\left\|\left[\frac{m}{m_j}\mathbf{e}_k'\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1} \quad \cdots \quad \frac{m}{m_j}\mathbf{e}_k'\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right]\right\|_2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{1}{10\sqrt{k_T}}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F.$$

Therefore, it resorts to proving a one-step-further sufficient condition that with a high probability, for any $j = 1, \cdots, l$ and $k \in T^c$, it holds

$$\left\|\left[\frac{m}{m_j}\mathbf{e}_k'\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1} \quad \cdots \quad \frac{m}{m_j}\mathbf{e}_k'\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right]\right\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{10\sqrt{k_T}}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F. \tag{59}$$

We apply the vector Berstein inequality to prove (59). First, for any $i = 1, \cdots, L$, and any $r \in K_{ij}$, let

$$g_{(i,r)} = \frac{1}{m_j}\mathbf{e}_k'\mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}'\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)i}.$$

Observe the fact that $\{\mathbf{a}_{(i)j}\}_{j\in K_{ij}}$ is the set of column vectors in $\sqrt{m}\mathbf{A}_{(i)}'P_{K_{ij}}$, which are nonzero. Also, recall the definition $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i,j)} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{A}_{(i)}'\mathcal{P}_{K_{ij}}\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$. For any $i = 1, \cdots, L$, it follows

$$\sum_{r\in K_{ij}} g_{(i,r)} = \frac{m}{m_j}\mathbf{e}_k'\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(i,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)i}. \tag{60}$$

For notation convenience, without loss of generality, suppose $K_{ij} = \{1, \cdots, m_j\}$, $\forall i = 1, \cdots, L$. For any $r = 1, \cdots, m_j$, we align the scalars $g_{(i,r)}$, $i = 1, \cdots, L$ into a single vector as $\left[g_{(1,r)}, \cdots, g_{(L,r)}\right]$. According to (60), this vector satisfies

$$\sum_{r=1}^{m_j}\left[g_{(1,r)}, \cdots, g_{(L,r)}\right] = \left[\frac{m}{m_j}\mathbf{e}_k'\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1}, \cdots, \frac{m}{m_j}\mathbf{e}_k'\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(L,j)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right].$$

Notice that $\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}$ is also a random variable. In the following proof, we apply the vector Berstein inequality conditioned on $\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}$. It is obvious that given $\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}$, $\left[g_{(1,r)},\cdots,g_{(L,r)}\right]$ are i.i.d. for different r and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left[g_{(1,r)},\cdots,g_{(L,r)}\right]\left|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\right.\right]=\frac{m}{m_j}\left[\mathbf{e}_k'\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1},\cdots,\mathbf{e}_k'\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\right]=0,$$

since $k\in T^c$. Next, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(g_{(i,r)}\right)^2\middle|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\right]=&\frac{1}{m_j^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbf{e}_k'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}'\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)i}\right)^2\middle|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\right]\\=&\frac{1}{m_j^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbf{e}_k'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}\right)^2\left(\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}'\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)i}\right)^2\middle|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\right]\\\leq&\frac{\mu_i}{m_j^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)i}'\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}'\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)i}\middle|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\right]\\\leq&\frac{\mu_i\kappa_i}{m_j^2}\|\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)i}\|_2^2.\end{aligned}$$

Therein, the first inequality follows from the definition of the incoherence parameter (7). The second inequality follows from the fact that for each $i=1,\cdots,L$, the sampled batches of vectors $\mathcal{P}_{K_{ij}}\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$ are not overlapped for different batches $j=1,\cdots,l$ such that $\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)i}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{(i,r)}$ are independent. Thus, we have

$$\sum_{r=1}^{m_j}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\left[g_{(1,r)},\cdots,g_{(L,r)}\right]\right\|_2^2\left|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\right.\right]\leq\sum_{r=1}^{m_j}\sum_{i=1}^{L}\frac{\mu_i\kappa_i}{m_j^2}\|\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)i}\|_2^2\leq\frac{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}}{m_j}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F^2\triangleq\sigma^2.$$

Moreover,

$$|g_{(i,r)}|=\frac{m}{m_j}\left|\mathbf{e}_k'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{(i)}^{-1}\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}'\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)i}\right|\leq\frac{m}{m_j}\sqrt{\mu_i}\left|\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}'\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)i}\right|\leq\frac{\mu_i}{m_j}\|\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)i}\|_2,$$

where the first inequality follows from the incoherence assumption (7) and the second inequality follows from the incoherence condition (6). Thus, it holds

$$\left\|\left[g_{(1,r)},\cdots,g_{(L,r)}\right]\right\|_2\leq\frac{\mu_{\max}}{m_j}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F\triangleq B.$$

Substituting the above bounds into the vector Berstein inequality conditioned on $\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}$ gives

$$Pr\left(\left\|\sum_{r=1}^{m_j}\left[g_{(1,r)},\cdots,g_{(L,r)}\right]\right\|_2\geq t\middle|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\right)\leq\exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{\frac{8\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}}{m_j}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F^2}+\frac{1}{4}\right).\tag{61}$$

We choose $t=\sqrt{\frac{24}{m_j}\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log n}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F$. First, we need to verify that such a choice satisfies $t\leq\frac{\sigma^2}{B}$. Recall that for any $j=1,\cdots,l$, $m_j\geq\frac{m}{4\log n}$. Since $k_T\leq\alpha\frac{m}{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log^2 n}$ and $\alpha\leq\frac{1}{9600}$, it holds

$$t\leq\frac{1}{10\sqrt{k_T}}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F\leq\kappa_{\max}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F=\frac{\sigma^2}{B}.$$

Thus, the choice of t is indeed valid. Substituting this t into (61) gives

$$Pr\left(\left\|\sum_{r=1}^{m_j}\left[g_{(1,r)},\cdots,g_{(L,r)}\right]\right\|_2 \geq \sqrt{\frac{24}{m_j}\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log n}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F\middle|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\right)\leq e^{\frac{1}{4}}n^{-3},$$

which implies

$$Pr\left(\left\|\sum_{r=1}^{m_j}\left[g_{(1,r)},\cdots,g_{(L,r)}\right]\right\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{10\sqrt{k_T}}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F\middle|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\right)\leq e^{\frac{1}{4}}n^{-3}.$$

Since the right-hand side does not depend on $\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}$, taking expectation from both sides regarding $\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}$ gives

$$Pr\left(\left\|\sum_{r=1}^{m_j}\left[g_{(1,r)},\cdots,g_{(L,r)}\right]\right\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{10\sqrt{k_T}}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F\right)\leq e^{\frac{1}{4}}n^{-3}.$$

Take a union bound over all $j=1,\cdots,l$ and $k\in T^c$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&Pr\left(\max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,l\},k\in T^c}\left\{\left\|\sum_{r=1}^{m_j}\left[g_{(1,r)},\cdots,g_{(L,r)}\right]\right\|_2\right\}\geq\frac{1}{10\sqrt{k_T}}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F\right)\\
\leq&\sum_{j=1}^{l}\sum_{k\in T^c}Pr\left(\left\|\sum_{r=1}^{m_j}\left[g_{(1,r)},\cdots,g_{(L,r)}\right]\right\|_2\geq\frac{1}{10\sqrt{k_T}}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F\right)\\
\leq&\sum_{j=1}^{l}\sum_{k\in T^c}e^{-\frac{1}{4}}n^{-3}\leq(\log n+1)\cdot n\cdot e^{\frac{1}{4}}n^{-3}\leq e^{\frac{1}{4}}n^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (59) and further implies that (57) holds. Finally, applying the contractions (41)-(42) gives

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{U}\|_{2,\infty}\leq\sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{1}{10\sqrt{k_T}}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(j-1)}\|_F\leq\sum_{j=1}^{l}\frac{1}{10\sqrt{k_T}}\frac{1}{2^j}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}\|_F\leq\frac{1}{10\sqrt{k_T}}\|\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}\|_F.$$

Substituting the bound on $\|\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}\|_F$ in (56) gives the desired result. Notice that the inequality $\|\mathcal{P}_{T^c}\mathbf{U}\|_{2,\infty}\leq\frac{1}{8}$ requires (39), (54) and (57) to hold simultaneously. ■

④ **Bounding the term:** $\|\mathcal{P}_{\Omega^c}\mathbf{W}\|_\infty\leq\frac{\lambda}{4}$.

Proof: According to the definition of $\mathbf{W}$ in (43), we aim to prove

$$\left\|\left[\ \sum_{j=1}^{l}\tfrac{m}{m_j}\mathcal{P}_{K_{1j}}\mathbf{A}_{(1)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)1},\quad\cdots,\quad\sum_{j=1}^{l}\tfrac{m}{m_j}\mathcal{P}_{K_{Lj}}\mathbf{A}_{(L)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)L}\ \right]\right\|_\infty\leq\frac{\lambda}{4}.$$

Notice that the batch sets K_{ij}, $j=1,\cdots,l$ are not overlapped. Therefore, it is enough to show with a high probability, for any $i=1,\cdots,L$, any $j=1,\cdots,l$, and any vector $\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}$ with $r\in K_{ij}$, it holds

$$\left|\frac{\sqrt{m}}{m_j}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)r}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(j-1)i}\right|\leq\frac{\lambda}{4}.$$

Equivalently, according to the definition of $\mathbf{Q}_{(j)}$ in (38), it is enough to prove for $j\geq 2$ it holds

$$\left|\frac{\sqrt{m}}{m_j}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)r}\left(\prod_{k=1}^{j-1}\mathcal{P}_T\left(\mathbf{I}-\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,k)}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right)\mathbf{q}_{(0)i}\right|\leq\frac{\lambda}{4},$$

and for $j=1$ it holds

$$\left|\frac{\sqrt{m}}{m_j}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)r}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{q}_{(0)i}\right| \leq \frac{\lambda}{4}.$$

In order to further simplify the notation, for any vector $\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}$ such that $r \in K_{ij}$, let

$$\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)} \triangleq \begin{cases} \mathbf{a}'_{(i)r}\left(\prod_{k=1}^{j-1}\mathcal{P}_T\left(\mathbf{I}-\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,k)}\right)\mathcal{P}_T\right), & \text{if } j\geq 2; \\ \mathbf{a}'_{(i)r}, & \text{if } j=1. \end{cases}$$

Our goal is to prove that for any $i=1,\cdots,L$, any $j=1,\cdots,l$, and any vector $\mathbf{a}_{(i,r)}$ in the j-th batch vectors $\mathcal{P}_{K_{ij}}A_{(i)}$, with a high probability it holds

$$\left|\frac{\sqrt{m}}{m_j}\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathbf{q}_{(0)i}\right| \leq \frac{\lambda}{4}. \tag{62}$$

Since both $\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}$ and $\mathbf{q}_{(0)i}$ are random variables, it is easier to first bound the left-hand side of (62) conditioned on $\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}$. Recall the definition of $\mathbf{Q}_{(0)}$ in (37), for any $i=1,\cdots,L$, it holds

$$\mathbf{q}_{(0)i} = \bar{\mathbf{v}}_i - \mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\text{sgn}(\mathbf{s}_i).$$

By the triangle inequality, we bound $\left|\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i\right|$ and $\left|\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\text{sgn}(\mathbf{s}_i)\right|$, respectively.

Let us first bound $\left|\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i\right|$ conditioned on $\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}$. From our assumption, the vector $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i$ is fixed except for the i.i.d. signs. Denote $|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|$ as the *entry-wise absolute value vector* of $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i$, which is not random. Then,

$$\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i = \left(\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\odot|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|\right)'\cdot\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i),$$

where $\odot$ denotes the entry-wise Hadamand product. Notice that $\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)$ and $\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}$ are mutually independent. Applying the Hoeffding inequality conditioned on $\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}$ gives

$$Pr\left\{\left|\left(\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\odot|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|\right)'\cdot\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)\right| \geq t \;\middle|\; \mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\right\} \leq 2\exp\left\{-\frac{t^2}{2\left\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\odot|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|\right\|_2^2}\right\}.$$

Since each entry of $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i$ is within $[-1,1]$, by taking $t=2\sqrt{\log n}\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2$, it follows

$$Pr\left\{\left|\left(\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\odot|\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i|\right)'\cdot\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i)\right| \geq 2\sqrt{\log n}\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2 \;\middle|\; \mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\right\} \leq 2n^{-2}. \tag{63}$$

Second, we bound $\left|\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i)\right|$ conditioned on $\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}$. The key is to prove the argument that $\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}$ is independent of $\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i)$. Notice that by definition, $\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}$ is generated by the column vectors in $\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}$ with column indices from the batch sets K_{ij}, $j=1,\cdots,l$. Recall the definition of these batch sets under (37), $\cup_{j=1}^{l}K_{ij}\subseteq\Omega_i^*\subseteq\Omega_i^c$. On the other hand, $\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\text{sgn}(\mathbf{s}_i)$ picks out those column vectors in $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$ with the column indices from Ω_i. Since different columns of $\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}$ are i.i.d. samples from the distribution $\mathcal{F}_i$, the argument holds true.

Moreover, since the noise support Ω_i are assumed to be fixed and the signs of noise matrix are i.i.d., $\mathbf{A}_{(i)}$ and $\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i)$ are also independent. We write

$$\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\sum_{x\in\Omega_i}\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathbf{a}_{(i)x}\cdot\text{sgn}(\bar{s}_{ix}).$$

Then, for any $x\in\Omega_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{a}_{(i)x}\text{sgn}(\bar{s}_{ix})\middle|\,\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\right] = \mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{a}'_{(i)x}\right]\mathbb{E}\left[\text{sgn}(\bar{s}_{ix})\right] = 0,\\
&\left|\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{a}_{(i)x}\text{sgn}(\bar{s}_{ix})\right| \le \sqrt{\mu_i k_T}\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2,\\
&\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{a}_{(i)x}\text{sgn}(\bar{s}_{ix})\right|^2\middle|\,\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\right] = \mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{a}_{(i)x}\mathbf{a}'_{(i)x}\mathcal{P}_T\right]\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)} \le \kappa_i\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, using the one dimensional Berstein inequality (which can also be regarded as a special case of the matrix Berstein inequality), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&Pr\left\{\left|\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i)\right| > \frac{t}{\sqrt{m}}\middle|\,\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\right\}\\
=&Pr\left\{\left|\sum_{x\in\Omega_i}\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathbf{a}_{(i)x}\cdot\text{sgn}(\bar{s}_{ix})\right| > t\middle|\,\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\right\}\\
\le&2\exp\left(-\frac{\frac{1}{2}t^2}{k_{\Omega_i}\kappa_i\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2^2 + \sqrt{k_T\mu_i}\frac{\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2 t}{3}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $k_{\max}\le\gamma\frac{m}{\kappa_{\max}}$ with $\gamma\le\frac{1}{4}$ and $k_T\le\alpha\frac{m}{\mu_{\max}\kappa_{\max}\log^2 n}$ with $\alpha\le\frac{1}{9600}$, choosing $t = 2\sqrt{m\log n}\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&Pr\left\{\left|\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i)\right| > 2\sqrt{\log n}\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2\middle|\,\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\right\}\\
\le&2\exp\left\{-\frac{2m\log n}{\frac{m}{4}+\frac{1}{60\sqrt{6\log n}}}\right\} \le 2n^{-2}.
\end{aligned}\tag{64}$$

Combining (63) and (64) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&Pr\left\{\left|\frac{\sqrt{m}}{m_j}\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathbf{q}_{(0)i}\right| > 4\sqrt{\log n}\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2\middle|\,\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\right\}\\
\le&Pr\left\{\left|\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathcal{P}_T\mathbf{A}'_{(i)}\text{sgn}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i)\right| > 2\sqrt{\log n}\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2\middle|\,\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\right\}\\
&+ Pr\left\{\left|\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_i\right| \ge 2\sqrt{\log n}\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2\middle|\,\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\right\} \le 4n^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that because we bound the probability conditioned on $\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}$, the bound hold for any $j = 1,\cdots,l$

and any $r \in K_{ij}$. Now take a union bound over all $i = 1, \cdots, L$,

$$\begin{aligned} &Pr\left\{\bigcup_{i=1}^{L}\left\{\left|\frac{\sqrt{m}}{m_j}\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathbf{q}_{(0)i}\right| > 4\sqrt{\log n}\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2\right\}\middle|\, \mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\right\} \\ \leq &\sum_{i=1}^{L} Pr\left\{\left|\frac{\sqrt{m}}{m_j}\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathbf{q}_{(0)i}\right| > 4\sqrt{\log n}\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2\middle|\, \mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\right\} \\ \leq &L \cdot 4n^{-2} \leq 4n^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from $k_T L \leq n$. Since the right-hand side does not depend on $\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}$ and the inequality holds for any $j = 1, \cdots, l$, any $r \in K_{ij}$, and any $i = 1, \cdots, L$, with probability at least $1 - 4n^{-1}$ it follows

$$\left|\frac{\sqrt{m}}{m_j}\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathbf{q}_{(0)i}\right| \leq 4\sqrt{\log n}\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2. \tag{65}$$

Next, we bound $\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2$ using contractions (41)-(42). According to Lemma 7, with probability at least $1 - 2n^{-1}$, (41)-(42) hold simultaneously. Thus, with probability at least $1 - 2n^{-1}$, for any $j \geq 3$, any $r \in K_{ij}$, and any $i = 1, \cdots, L$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2 \leq &\|\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}\|_2 \left\| \left(\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} \mathcal{P}_T \left(\mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{(1,k)} \right) \mathcal{P}_T \right) \right\|_{(2,2)} \\ \leq &\frac{1}{\log n} \frac{1}{2^{j-1}} \sqrt{k_T \mu_{\max}} \leq \frac{1}{\log^2 n} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha m}{\kappa_{\max}}}, \end{aligned}$$

given $k_T \leq \alpha \frac{m}{\mu_{max}\kappa_{max}\log^2 n}$. Thus, combining with (65) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\frac{\sqrt{m}}{m_j}\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathbf{q}_{(0)i}\right| &\leq \frac{m}{m_j} 4 \left(\log^{-\frac{3}{2}} n\right) \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\kappa_{\max}}} \\ &\leq \frac{16}{\sqrt{9600}} \left(\log^{-\frac{1}{2}} n\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa_{\max}}} \\ &= \frac{2}{5\sqrt{6}} \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{\kappa_{\max}}} \leq \frac{\lambda}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

given $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{9600}$.

On the other hand, for any $j \leq 2$, any $r \in K_{ij}$, and any $i = 1, \cdots, L$, it holds

$$\|\mathbf{g}_{(i,r)}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{a}_{(i)r}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{k_T \mu_{\max}} \leq \frac{1}{\log n} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha m}{\kappa_{\max}}},$$

given $k_T \leq \alpha \frac{m}{\mu_{max}\kappa_{max}\log^2 n}$. Thus, combining with (65) again gives

$$\left|\frac{\sqrt{m}}{m_j}\mathbf{g}'_{(i,r)}\mathbf{q}_{(0)i}\right| \leq \frac{m}{m_i} 4 (\log^{-\frac{1}{2}} n) \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\kappa_{max}}} \leq \frac{2}{5\sqrt{6}} \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{\kappa_{\max}}} \leq \frac{\lambda}{4}, \tag{66}$$

given $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{9600}$. Hence, we finish the proof. Notice that this bound requires (39) and (65) to hold simultaneously. ■

⑤ **Estimation of the total success probability.**

So far, we have proved that ①, ②, ③, ④ hold with a high probability, respectively. We want a success probability in recovering the true signal, which not only requires ①, ②, ③, ④ to hold simultaneously, but also requires (10), (11), Corollary 2, and Lemma 4 to succeed. From the above proofs, we have

- The bound ① is implied by (54) (holds with probability $1-4n^{-1}$).
- The bound ② is implied by (39) (holds with probability $1-2n^{-1}$) and (54).
- The bound ③ is implied by (39), (54) and (57) (holds with probability $1-e^{\frac{1}{4}}n^{-1}$)
- The bound ④ is implied by (39) and (65) (holds with probability $1-4n^{-1}$).

Thus, we take a union bound to get

$$Pr\{①\cup②\cup③\cup④\}\geq 1-4n^{-1}-2n^{-1}-e^{-\frac{1}{4}}n^{-1}-4n^{-1}=1-\left(10+e^{\frac{1}{4}}\right)n^{-1}.$$

On the other hand, taking a union bound over (10), (11), Corollary 2, and Lemma 4 to find that they hold simultaneously with probability at least $1-\left(6+e^{\frac{1}{4}}\right)n^{-2}$. Summarizing the above results, we know that the success probability in recovering the true signal and error matrices is at least $1-(16+2e^{\frac{1}{4}})n^{-1}$.

REFERENCES

[1] D. Donoho, "Compressed sensing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 1289–1306, Apr. 2006.

[2] E. J. Candès, J. Romberg, and T. Tao, "Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information," *IEEE Transaction on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 5406–5425, Feb. 2006.

[3] M. Yuan and Y. Lin, "Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 49–67, Feb. 2007.

[4] E. J. Candès and B. Recht,"Exact matrix completion via convex optimization," *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 717–772, Dec. 2008.

[5] E. Candes, "Mathematics of sparsity (and a few other things)," *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, Seoul, South Korea, 2014.

[6] Y. Eldar, P. Kuppinger, and H. Bölcskei, "Block-sparse signals: Uncertainty relations and efficient recovery," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3042–3054, Jun. 2010.

[7] M. E. Davis and Y. C. Eldar, "Rank awareness in joint sparse recovery," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 1135-146, Feb. 2012.

[8] D. Malioutov, M. Çetin, and A. S. Willsky, "A sparse signal reconstruction perspective for source localization with sensor arrays," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 53, no. 8, pp. 3010–3022, Aug. 2005.

[9] X. Wei, Y. Yuan, and Q. Ling, "DOA estimation using a greedy block coordinate descent algorithm," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 60, no. 12 pp. 6382–6394, Dec. 2012.

[10] F. Zeng, C. Li and Z. Tian, "Distributed compressive spectrum sensing in cooperative multihop cognitive networks," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 37–48, Feb. 2011.

[11] J. Meng, W. Yin, H. Li, E. Hossain, and Z. Han, "Collaborative spectrum sensing from sparse observations in cognitive radio networks," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 327–337, Feb. 2011.

[12] J. A. Bazerque, G. Mateos, and G. B. Giannakis, "Group-lasso on splines for spectrum cartography," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 4648–4663, Oct. 2011.

[13] Z. Gao, L. F. Cheong, and Y. X. Wang, "Block-sparse RPCA for salient motion detection," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 36, no. 10, pp. 1975-1987, 2014.

[14] Y. C. Eldar and M. Mishali, "Robust recovery of signals from a structured union of subspaces," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, no. 11, pp. 5302-5316, Nov. 2009.

[15] M. Golbabaee and P. Vandergheynst, "Compressed sensing of simultaneous low-rank and joint-sparse matrices," preprint at http://arxiv.org/abs/1211.5058, 2012.

[16] S. Oymak, A. Jalali, M. Fazel, Y. C. Eldar, and B. Hassibi, "Simultaneously structured models with application to sparse and low-rank matrices," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 2886-2908, Feb. 2015.

[17] E. Dall'Anese, J. A. Bazerque, and G. B. Giannakis, "Group sparse lasso for cognitive network sensing robust to model uncertainties and outliers," *Physical Communication*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 161–172, Jun. 2012.

[18] J. Wright and Y. Ma, "Dense error correction via ℓ_1-minimization," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 3540-3560, Jul. 2010.

[19] X. Li, "Compressed sensing and matrix completion with constant proportion of corruptions," *Constructive Approximation*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 73–99, Feb. 2013.

[20] N. H. Nguyen and T. D. Tran, "Exact recoverability from dense corrupted observations via ℓ_1 minimization," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 2017–2035, Apr. 2013

[21] E. J. Candès, X. Li, Y. Ma, and J. Wright, "Robust principal component analysis?" *Journal of the ACM*, vol. 58, no. 3, Article 11, May 2011.

[22] A. Ganesh, K. Min, J. Wright, and Y. Ma, "Robust matrix decomposition with sparse corruptions," In: *Proceedings of IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 1281–1285, Cambridge, Jul. 2012.

[23] Y. Chen, A. Jalali, S. Sanghavi and C. Caramanis, "Low-rank Matrix Recovery from Errors and Erasures," *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 7, Jul. 2013.

[24] D. Gross, "Recovering low-rank matrices from few coefficients in any basis," *IEEE Transaction on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 1548-1566, Mar. 2009.

[25] E. J. Candès and Y. Plan, "A probabilistic and RIPless theory of compressed sensing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, pp. 7235-7254, Aug. 2010.

[26] R. Kueng and D. Gross, "RIPless compressed sensing from anisotropic measurements," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 441, pp. 110-123, Jan. 2014.

[27] M. Ledoux, *The Concentration of Measure Phenomenon, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs 89. Providence*, RI: American Mathematical Society, 2001.